C.L. Coffey

JUNE 1964

MONTHLY REVIEW

N INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST MAGAZINE

VOL. 16
2

BRAZIL

THE EDITORS

BRAZIL: REQUIEM FOR AN ILLUSION

PABLO M. ARRIAGA

MR's Fifteenth Anniversary

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTENTS | VOLUME SIXTEEN NUMBER TWO JUNE 1964

REVIEW OF THE MONTH: Brazil, Latin America, and the United States.... 65
BRAZIL: REQUIEM FOR AN ILLUSION by Pablo M. Arriaga..... 84
THE AFRO-ASIAN PEOPLES
AND LATIN AMERICA by Gregorio Goldenberg..... 90
DEBUNKING THE DEBUNKER by Günther Anders..... 104
MR'S FIFTEENTH ANNIVERSARY
BIRTHDAY SPEECH by Barrows Dunham..... 111
BIRTHDAY MESSAGES..... 114
BIRTHDAY SONG by E. Y. Harburg..... 116
WORLD EVENTS by Scott Nearing..... 121

MONTHLY REVIEW: Published monthly except July and August when bimonthly, and copyright ©1964, by Monthly Review, Inc. Second class postage paid at New York, N. Y.
EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS: 333 Sixth Avenue, New York 14, New York.
Telephone: CHelsea 2-6494.
Unsolicited manuscripts will not be returned unless accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope.
NEWSSTAND DISTRIBUTOR: B. De Boer, 188 High Street, Nutley, N. J.
SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: One year—$6 in the U.S.; $7 foreign.
By 1st class mail—U.S. $9; everywhere else $11.
By air mail—No. America $11; So. America and Europe $15; Asia (incl. USSR), Africa, Australia $17.
EDITORS: Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy.

NOTES FROM THE EDITORS

MR's Fifteenth Anniversary Party is over. We had a fine time and, we are persuaded by the multitude of phone calls and letters, so did the other 600 people present. Our thanks to all the participants who helped make the evening so memorable an occasion.

We print below two more of the messages received for which we had no space in the pages of this issue:

RALPH MILIBAND
London School of Economics

By helping to keep alive the voice of socialism in the United States in a period of extreme difficulty, Paul Sweezy and Leo Huberman have earned our deep gratitude. For many people outside America, MONTHLY REVIEW has come to stand for the promise of the revival of American socialism. May the growth of its influence in the coming years hasten that revival.

CHARLES BETTELHEIM
The Sorbonne, Paris

All my wishes for the successful continuation of MONTHLY REVIEW and its publications. I would also like to add how useful they are because of their high quality, excellent analysis, and political interest.

(continued on inside back cover)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BRAZIL, LATIN AMERICA, AND THE UNITED STATES

The coup d'état which took place in Brazil at the beginning of April can best be understood as fitting into a number of intricately interlocking patterns of relations and events.

First, there is the pattern of civilian-military relations in Brazilian national life. Second, there is the pattern of political trends in Latin American politics. And finally, there is the pattern of developing United States policy toward Latin America. Although these are all aspects of a single whole, it will be useful to consider them separately.

The Role of the Military in Brazil

Considered in the context of civilian-military relations in Brazil, what has just happened in that country is depressingly familiar. Compared to the Spanish-speaking American countries, the role of the military in Brazil during most of the 19th century was modest. Nevertheless, it was the military which put its weight behind the abolition of slavery in 1888 and overthrew the monarchy in 1889. By these acts the Brazilian military staked out for itself a role in the republic which it has never relinquished.

That role has not, in general, been one of directly ruling the country but rather of deciding who would be allowed to rule and within what limits. The criterion by which these decisions have been made has been, again speaking generally, the simple one of preserving intact the existing socio-economic structure with its extreme class differences and essential subordination to foreign imperialism (largely British before the First World War, increasingly American between the wars, and almost exclusively American after the Second World War). The military has done well for itself within this structure, unobtrusively occupying key (and well paid) economic and political

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

positions, and providing a much needed channel of upward mobility for able young people in the middle and lower middle reaches of the social hierarchy. This arrangement has enabled the Brazilian armed forces to avoid the militaristic excesses of Hispanic America and even to acquire a quite undeserved but, as we shall see, not unimportant reputation for devotion to democracy and constitutionalism.*

Against this background, we can understand a certain sequence of events which has continuously repeated itself since the Second World War. Once the relative prosperity of the war period was over, the lopsided Brazilian semi-colonial economy began in earnest to generate the kind of increasingly severe tensions and crises peculiar to that form of society.** In these circumstances, the regime in power, which in the Brazilian system is wholly identified with the person of the President, finds itself faced with an inescapable dilemma. If it does nothing, the tensions and crises will grow to explosive dimensions. On the other hand, the only policy which holds out any hope of success is one of basic structural reforms which could be carried out only at the expense of powerful groups, both domestic and foreign, with enormous vested interests in the status quo. Placed in this position, a President may be tempted to take the road of reform and national independence. To do so, however, he would have to seek a new political base, which could be found only in the impoverished and largely dis-

---

* On all this, see John J. Johnson, *The Military and Society in Latin America*, Palo Alto, 1964, Part III. Johnson repeats the familiar clichés about the supposedly democratic character of the Brazilian military, but his book has the merit of providing all the facts necessary to expose their absurdity. On the theoretical level, Johnson's book is inferior to the other standard work in English on the subject, Edwin Lieuwen, *Arms and Politics in Latin America*, New York, 1960; though it must be added that unfortunately this is not saying much for the theoretical level of Lieuwen's book. Both works demonstrate, by negative example, the importance of approaching complicated socio-historical problems from an historical materialist point of view.

** For an understanding of the nature and causes of these tensions and crises, see Paul A. Baran, *The Political Economy of Growth*, especially Chapters 5, 6, and 7. It is no exaggeration to say that without such an understanding it is impossible to make sense out of what is happening in the world today.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

franchised popular masses. Structural reform is thus inseparable from what amounts to a political revolution, both of which are anathema to the oligarchy and its military guardians. A Brazilian President is therefore a classic example of one who is damned if he does and damned if he doesn't. If he does nothing, he is certain to become discredited and to lose his usefulness to the oligarchy. If he tries to do something effective, he is equally certain to face the wrath of the oligarchy and ouster by the military. Vargas (elected in 1950), Quadros (elected in 1960), and Goulart (replaced Quadros in 1961) were all caught in this trap, and none escaped. Kubitschek, elected in 1955, was also caught but managed to hold on to the end of his term, thanks mainly to a policy of lavish generosity to the military. (Kubitschek is famous as the builder of the new capital city of Brasilia; it is less well known that during his tenure of office more money was spent on the armed forces than on all forms of public works, Brasilia included.)

The military allowed Vargas to take office in 1950 under a sort of tacit agreement that he would not press forward with the kind of nationalistic and pro-labor reforms he had inaugurated in the special conditions of the 1930's. When his Minister of Labor, Joao Goulart, became active in building up trade union support for the regime, the military, interpreting such activity as a breach of faith, first forced Goulart's dismissal and then demanded Vargas's own resignation. Rather than submit, Vargas shot himself, leaving behind a suicide note bitterly condemning the foreign and domestic forces of reaction which had done him in.

In 1960, Janio Quadros was elected President by an unprecedented margin. His campaign symbol was a broom with which he promised to sweep out the corruption which flourished as never before under Kubitschek. Quadros knew that to make any progress at all he would need a wider popular political base, and he moved to acquire it not by proposing domestic reforms but by pursuing a somewhat more independent foreign policy. This was enough to alarm the beneficiaries and guardians of the status quo; and when, after the first Punta del Este conference in the summer of 1961, the President conferred a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

decoration on Che Guevara, who had represented Cuba at the conference, they moved as they had moved seven years earlier against Vargas. Quadros did not shoot himself, though the statement which he issued seems to have been consciously modeled on Vargas's suicide note. Instead, he resigned and soon afterwards left the country for a world-wide tour. This has been widely interpreted as the irrational conduct of an eccentric (which in some respects Quadros undoubtedly was, and is). A more reasonable interpretation would seem to be that Quadros was hoping for so strong a popular reaction to his resignation that the oligarchy would feel obliged to reinstate him in office, this time with a measure of power in his own right. But no such popular reaction was forthcoming: as far as the masses were concerned, Quadros had never offered anything worth fighting for.

Goulart, as Vice President, was the constitutional successor of Quadros, and if we are to understand what happened next it is necessary to keep in mind that the Brazilian military's reputation for devotion to democracy and constitutionalism has been as carefully cultivated as the United States' equally phony reputation for devotion to the goal of freedom for colonial peoples. There is a good reason for this: in Brazil, as in many other capitalist countries, the cult of elections, constitutions, etc., has proved to be an important instrument of ideological mystification, preventing the masses from understanding the real nature and causes of their exploitation and misery. The military has therefore as a rule refrained from interfering with constitutional processes except when there was a consensus among the generals that such action was necessary.

In the matter of Goulart's claim to the presidency, there was no such consensus. Because of his past relations with Vargas and his influence with a section of the trade union leadership, the generals disliked and distrusted Goulart. But they also knew that he was a corrupt opportunist who had made a fortune out of his political career, and at least a significant fraction of their number did not consider him to be dangerous. Hence Goulart's bid for the presidency found the military divided, while the popular forces, much more moved by this issue than by Quadros's resignation, rallied around the Goulart banner with

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an impressive show of militancy and determination. For a while the country was on the brink of a civil war the outcome of which was quite unpredictable, since the military would have been involved on both sides. From this prospect even the most anti-Goulart of the generals shrank back. A compromise was offered: Goulart would assume the presidency, but the office would be shorn of much of its power by a constitutional amendment inaugurating a parliamentary form of government. Leonel Brizola, Goulart's radical nationalist brother-in-law, urged the Vice President to stand firm on his rights, assuring him that the country was behind him and that this was a golden opportunity to break the power of the oligarchy and its military protectors. But that was not what Goulart wanted: the generals who considered him no danger were right. He accepted the compromise, and both the crisis and the opportunity passed.

For the next year and a half, Brazilian political life was dominated by Goulart's maneuvering to get the full powers of the presidency restored. In a way the parliamentary system suited the interests of the oligarchy to perfection: it was perfectly incapable of taking any effective action on anything. Under cover of this governmental stalemate, the orgy of inflation and corruption which had long been enriching the rich and impoverishing the poor could proceed uninterrupted. But the system also had a serious drawback: without a president to personify government power and responsibility, there was no one to blame for the nation's ills, hence no scapegoat to sacrifice when popular anger reached the flash point, as it was bound to do sooner or later. This, taken together with the fact that the people obviously preferred the traditional presidential system, tipped the balance in Goulart's favor.

With his full powers restored by the January 1963 referendum, Goulart now found himself in the familiar dilemma. If he let things go, he would soon become discredited—and expendable. If he took the road of structural reform, he would arouse the military to action, this time united against him in its determination to prevent a revolutionary breach of the status quo. This does not mean that it would have made no sense for Goulart to choose the road of reform. It would have, but only on condition that it be done wholeheartedly, with a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

maximum bid for popular support and thorough preparations to counter the inevitable military intervention.

Actually, Goulart never faced up to the choices open to him. He talked about reforms but never took any serious steps to bring them about. He made gestures to the Left but refrained from making any preparations to fight back against the predictable reactionary onslaught. Far from trying to organize a genuine popular movement, he sought always to calm the Left and conciliate the Right. The result was that he succeeded only in discrediting himself. When the military finally moved, no one lifted a finger in Goulart's defense. In this respect his fall was a repetition of that of Quadros before him.

This analysis, however, leaves one question unanswered: If Goulart was as weak and ineffectual as our description suggests, why did the military feel it necessary to overthrow him at this time?

There are at least two parts to the answer. In the first place, the economic situation was rapidly deteriorating. The rate of inflation, which had already reached a rate of 100 percent a year during 1963, was rapidly accelerating (according to one calculation, the trend was such that by the time of the scheduled elections in October of 1965 the price level would be doubling every day); labor unrest and strikes were on the rise; violence in the countryside, both organized and unorganized, was occurring with increasing frequency. But these trends by themselves might not have triggered a military intervention if it had not been for the fact that for the first time in Brazilian history a serious left-wing movement was beginning to take shape. Major aspects of this crucially important development were described and analyzed in the article "The Brazilian Crisis," by Victor Rico Galan, which appeared in the April issue of MR, and there is no need to repeat here. Suffice it to say that the virtual monopoly position which the ultra-reformist leadership of the Communist Party long held in the Brazilian Left had disintegrated in the last year or so; that the radicalization of the student movement was proceeding rapidly; that a revolutionary nationalist leadership of real stature was emerging in the persons of such men as Leonel Brizola, Francisco Juliao, and Paulo de Tarso; that a serious effort to organize and unify

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the forces of the Left was under way in the form of the Front of Popular Mobilization; and finally and perhaps most ominously from the generals' point of view, that the growing sergeants' movement was threatening to undermine the reliability of the military itself as the ultimate weapon of reaction (that the coup, when it came, was a direct response to a "mutiny" by navy enlisted men tells us much about the generals' state of mind).

Goulart, of course, was in no way responsible for this upsurge of the Left. But he did tolerate it, and that was his crime in the eyes of the Right. The military probably thought that, given existing economic and political trends, another year and a half of Goulart (the remaining length of his term of office) would be enough to lay the groundwork of a real revolution in Brazil. On this calculation there was no time to lose.

If this explanation of the timing of the coup is correct, it suggests that there is an important difference between the coups against Vargas and Quadros on the one hand and the present coup against Goulart on the other. In the earlier cases, the respective Presidents seem to have been the real targets of the military's action. They were trying to provide themselves with a popular political base and in this way acquire genuine political power in their own right. The military rightly looked upon this as a challenge to its position as the ultimate arbiter of Brazilian politics and moved to eliminate the source of the danger. In the case of Goulart, a deeper issue was involved. No doubt he too was trying to widen his political base, and this may have played a role in the military's determination to oust him. But a much more important consideration was to get rid of Goulart as a necessary preliminary to attacking and breaking up the newly emerging Left.

This difference explains other differences between the earlier coups and the present one. When Vargas was forced out, the military remained quietly behind the scenes. Pending new elections, civilians were left in nominal control as provided in the Constitution. Apart from the disappearance of Vargas himself, the political life of the country continued pretty much as before. In the case of Quadros too, the military operated

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

offstage; and though, as we have already noted, the question of the succession was not solved so easily, still constitutional forms were carefully observed and once the crisis over the succession was settled and the parliamentary experiment abandoned, political life reverted to normal. In both cases ideological battle cries were notably absent, and neither ouster was followed by a political purge of the former President's followers.

The coup which overthrew Goulart had a different character in all these respects. The military operated in the open, rudely shouldering aside the right-wing politicians who had hoped to be the main beneficiaries of Goulart's downfall. The whole operation took place under the banner of anti-Communism, though in fact of course Goulart is no more a Communist (of any kind) than were Vargas and Quadros. Constitutional norms were crudely violated at every stage: a provisional president was sworn in while Goulart, who never resigned, was still in the country; a general was elected to fill out Goulart's term without any consideration for the constitutional provision forbidding former members of the armed forces to stand for office until they have been civilians for a minimum period; and, most blatant of all, the whole political process, including the Constitution itself, was subordinated to a so-called Institutional Act promulgated, without a shadow of legal justification, by the three armed services ministers. This Act not only establishes a naked military dictatorship (any bill sent to Congress by the President automatically becomes law after 30 days regardless of whether it is acted upon or not), but revives governmental practices which cannot but arouse feelings of loathing and disgust in anyone who takes pride in the historic struggles of Americans, both North and South, to win civil liberties and establish the rule of law. Thus the Act authorizes the wholesale issuance by the executive of what are called bills of attainder in our jurisprudence and are specifically prohibited in our Constitution. "An estimated 10,000 Brazilians have been arrested or have lost their political rights since President Joao Goulart was ousted by the military a month ago," Dan Kurzman reported to the *Washington Post*. And he went on to say:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Many Brazilians are actually more concerned about the loss of political rights (more than 160 have been stripped of such rights) than by the arrests.

Whereas an arrest does not necessarily represent a penalty for wrongdoing—many are being released after investigation and others soon will get trials—those deprived of their rights have been condemned without trial in the most arbitrary manner.

Victims learned from the newspapers that they were on the "list." (Reprinted in the York, Pennsylvania, *Gazette and Daily*, May 4.)

All of this represents a sharp departure from the past methods and practices of the Brazilian military, which, as we have seen, have always been designed to give the impression of scrupulous regard for legality and democracy. And the only possible explanation, it seems to us, is that the real target of the coup was not Goulart who could easily have been dealt with as Vargas and Quadros were, but a new force in Brazilian life which the military judges to be potentially so powerful and so dangerous to the existing social order that it not only may but must be fought by all the weapons in the tyrant's arsenal.

Political Trends in Latin America

It is obvious but still needs to be emphasized that the military takeover in Brazil is part of a continent-wide trend.

On March 29, 1962, President Arturo Frondizi of Argentina was overthrown by the military. Since then military coups have taken place in the following countries (listed in order of occurrence): Peru, Guatemala, Ecuador, Dominican Republic, Honduras, and Brazil. Thus in the short space of two years the military took over in countries accounting for two thirds of the area and 58 percent of the population of Latin America (excluding Cuba). In Argentina and Peru, the generals, after a period of open or thinly disguised rule, allowed elections and the restoration of constitutional forms. In all other cases, constitutional forms remain in abeyance and the military continues to rule directly or through civilian puppets. This difference is not unimportant—the citizen of Argentina today, for example, enjoys a much greater degree of freedom than the citizen of Brazil—but it should not be allowed to obscure the reality that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in all these countries real power continues to remain with the military. The civilian governments of Argentina and Peru can act only within limits set by the military, and any attempt to overstep these limits will bring renewed military intervention.

We are not suggesting of course that this situation prevails only in those countries where coups have recently occurred, but rather that these coups illustrate a situation which prevails generally in Latin America. The warning issued in 1955 by Eduardo Santos, former leader of the Colombian Liberal Party, has turned out to be all too accurate:

> Against whom are we Latin Americans arming ourselves? Why are our countries ruining themselves buying arms which they will never use? . . .
>
> Have we perhaps a military role to play in the great international world conflicts? . . . In this day of the atom bomb, with the new arms whose cost is fabulous, with technical systems involving thousands of millions, what are our poor countries about, bankrupting themselves upon armaments which in the event of an international conflict would spell absolutely nothing? Then, what we are doing is building up armies which weigh nothing in the international scale but which are juggernauts for the internal life of each country. Each country is being occupied by its own army. (Quoted in Edwin Lieuwen, *Arms and Politics in Latin America,* pp. 237-238.)

Three questions suggest themselves in this connection: Will the trend of the past two years toward an increasingly direct role for the military in the governing process continue in the period ahead? Can any of the Latin American countries hope to escape being subdued by its own army? Under what conditions can civilian rule be restored and its continuation be guaranteed? We can best answer these questions after we have taken into account the pattern of developing United States policy toward Latin America.

United States Policy in Latin America

People on the Left often treat the Alliance for Progress (ALPRO) as though it were nothing but a figleaf to hide the nakedness of imperialist exploitation of Latin America. That this is part of the story is certainly true, but there is another part which is equally true and considerably more instructive.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Cuban Revolution showed that traditional American policy toward Latin America—keep the region exploitable but otherwise let the local oligarchies manage, or rather mismanage, their own economies and societies—was approaching total bankruptcy. The contradictions of semi-colonial society had reached the point of explosion. Either something had to be done to resolve, or at least ameliorate, these contradictions or the whole of Latin America would follow the example of Cuba. President Kennedy and his advisers, including a number of able intellectuals well versed in the intricacies of modern economics and econometrics, understood this well enough. ALPRO was their answer.

The idea behind ALPRO was derived from the latest fashionable theories of economic development which may be summarized as follows: Once upon a time all countries lived under feudal or tribal social structures and were economically underdeveloped. One fine day, a new class of entrepreneurs appeared in some of these countries. These bold and adventurous types founded businesses, invented new machines and devised new methods, accumulated capital. From these centers market relations and the enterprising spirit spread out to encompass the entire economy. Old and outdated forms of landholding, of labor relations, of taxation, of upper-class attitudes toward consumption and saving, etc., were more or less rapidly transformed. Somewhere along the line, the countries so affected reached what Rostow calls the "take-off" point: from then on more or less rapid economic development became their normal state. Meanwhile, the countries in which entrepreneurs failed to make an appearance remained bogged down in their old ways. Naturally, the gap between the developing countries and the underdeveloped countries steadily widened, and it is this which lies at the root of most of the troubles in the world today. The people living in the underdeveloped countries began to want what their more fortunate fellows in the developing countries were actually getting. This by itself would not necessarily be too troublesome except for the added fact that the Russian Revolution—usually treated as a sort of historical accident arising out of the special circumstances of the First World War—opened up a new road to economic

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

development, one in which the state plays the role of the entrepreneurs and capitalists in the "Western" system. The underdeveloped countries are therefore no longer condemned to remain in a state of darkness unless or until released by the providential appearance of the entrepreneurs. They can now follow in the footsteps of the Russians; indeed quite a few of them have done so in the last two decades.

From this analysis the Kennedyans drew the conclusion that the only way to save the "free world" from more—and ultimately disastrous—defections would be somehow to jolt its underdeveloped members out of their age-old ruts and to get them bowling down the runway to the take-off. And this was the purpose which ALPRO was designed to serve. Its major premise was that there is enough good entrepreneur material, domestic and foreign, available to the underdeveloped countries, and that what is now needed above all is to create an environment in which these actual or potential entrepreneurs can operate to the maximum benefit of all concerned. Once such an environment is achieved, the problem of underdevelopment will solve itself. But this requires that antiquated social structures should be scrapped and in their place should be put the institutions required by a modern capitalist society—in other words, it requires far-reaching reforms in the land system, in the money and banking system, in the levying and collection of taxes, and so on. It also requires a healthier and better educated labor force, and a more highly developed economic infrastructure (roads, utilities, port facilities, etc.). The theory of ALPRO was that by the conditional offering of generous assistance to the underdeveloped countries, they could be induced to institute these reforms and thus set the stage for the take-off into perpetual development.

In fact, of course, nothing of the sort has happened. ALPRO has degenerated into a patchwork of handouts, some for projects like sanitation and waterworks which in themselves are worthy enough, but more often simply to offset balance-of-payments deficits which are but symptoms of Latin America's economic malaise; no reforms worth the name have been inaugurated, still less carried out; and Latin America as

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a whole, far from revving up for the take-off, has been slipping deeper and deeper into the quagmire of underdevelopment.

Some see in the fiasco of ALPRO merely errors in planning and execution; the basic conception, they say, was and remains sound. Nothing could be further from the truth. *The whole theory of development/underdevelopment on which it is based is a tissue of fallacies.* The developing countries did not simply take off and leave the underdeveloped countries standing at the post. The developing countries conquered and enslaved the rest of the world, drew from it much of the means for their own development, imposed upon it special new crippling forms of underdevelopment, above all entrenched in power both in the metropolis and in the periphery a network of classes and groups with the strongest conceivable vested interest in maintaining the development/underdevelopment status quo.* To imagine that under these circumstances the tiny minority of exploiting monopolists who batten on the misery of the Latin American masses are going to let themselves be bribed by a few measly handouts into instituting reforms that at best will generate more mouths to share the feast and at worst might open the floodgates of revolution—to imagine this is to display a degree of naivete or ignorance which even an establishment intellectual ought to be ashamed of. All the more so since, as the experience of the last three years has so clearly shown, the handouts can be had without the reforms anyway!

We do not pretend to know whether anyone in Washington has really learned anything from this experience. Probably not: in order to understand complicated events one has to start out with a theory which is capable of making sense out of them, and there is little evidence that anyone in Washington is equipped with anything as handy as that. But a good politician like Lyndon Johnson can certainly recognize a failure when he sees it, whether or not he understands the reasons for it. It may even be that a change in Latin American policy away from

* Once again the reader is referred to Paul Baran's *Political Economy of Growth* in which for the first time the methods of Marxism are used to block out in bold and imaginative outline a comprehensive theory of the relation between economic development and underdevelopment.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reliance on ALPRO was under way before Kennedy's death. In any case, Johnson's appointment of Thomas Mann as Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs and the centralizing of all Latin American policy-making in his hands clearly signalized that such a change had been decided upon, since Mann, a Texan and former Ambassador to Mexico, is well known as an "old Latin American hand" who has no use for the kind of reforms ALPRO was supposed to promote.

The new approach, or rather the return to the pre-ALPRO approach, is well summed up in a May 4th Washington dispatch to the *New York Times* by Tad Szulc on the occasion of the announcement of the resignation of Teodoro Moscoso as United States representative on the Inter-American Committee for the Alliance for Progress. After noting that Moscoso "for two years personified Alliance goals," Szulc goes on:

> His departure is viewed as ending an era in which the United States, leading the 10-year cooperative program inaugurated by President Kennedy in 1961, sought to encourage social and political reform in Latin America.
>
> Under the Johnson administration the Alliance, in the eyes of Latin Americans, has lost much of the content that had so much appeal. They view it as gradually turning into a standard program of economic assistance on a highly selective basis. . . .
>
> The consensus in those quarters is that the program as conceived by President Kennedy no longer exists, and that Washington seems to have returned to its unilateral approach to problems of the Hemisphere. . . .
>
> The first inconsistency [with statements of support for the Alliance by Johnson] . . . appeared almost simultaneously with his speech to the Organization of American States praising the new multinational character of the Alliance. Mr. Johnson sent his foreign aid message to Congress singling out Colombia and Chile as two of six countries in the world to which two thirds of United States development lending would be earmarked in the fiscal year 1965.
>
> Alliance officials then expressed the view that if the United States picked two Latin American countries beforehand for the bulk of aid under the Alliance, the functions of the new committee became almost academic. . . .
>
> But the major Latin American criticism, heard here and apparent in editorial comments in the Latin press, deals with the charge that the Johnson administration has completely de-empha-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sized the Alliance and its political character in favor of what the new team calls the "pragmatic approach."

This "pragmatism," which in the view of many observers includes a passive United States attitude toward military take-overs in Latin America, has come under public criticism by such Congressional leaders as Senator Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota, the majority whip. (*New York Times,* May 5.)

This last paragraph points to the second major change in Latin American policy instituted by the Johnson administration and "unofficially" announced to the world in March through a leak to the press of the content of an address by Mann to a gathering of government officials concerned with Latin American affairs. The policy of refusing recognition to regimes which had come to power through unconstitutional coups, Mann explained, had failed to produce useful results. From now on, therefore, the United States would deal with such coups on a case-by-case basis, recognizing or refusing recognition according to what seemed at the time to be in the United States interest.

On the face of it, this might seem to be really no change in policy, since the Kennedy administration had always finally come around to recognizing governments which came to power through (right-wing) military take-over. But this is to miss the point. Under Kennedy, such coups were definitely discouraged, a fact which undoubtedly had a certain deterrent effect; while the new Mann doctrine proclaims in advance that the United States has no objection in principle. The point was neatly put by Ronald Hilton, Director of Stanford University's Institute of Hispanic American and Luzo-Brazilian Studies:

> The Brazilian coup came shortly after the enunciation of the new U. S. policy toward Latin America. Other Latin American governments should ponder the fact that their armies are saying to themselves, "Ask not for whom the green light blinks, it blinks for you." (*Hispanic American Report,* April, 1964, p. 102.)

In the light of all this, a sensational article which appeared in the Mexican weekly *Siempre!* of April 29th has a solid ring of authenticity about it. Written by José Natividad Rosales and bearing the headline "The Thomas Mann Plan Against Latin America," the article opens with the following paragraphs:

> Mr. Thomas Mann, Under Secretary of State and Coordinator

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Latin American Affairs has an entire mail-fisted plan for Latin America. Secret documents were sent by him to United States embassies in the Latin American countries in which are specified the *principal points* of North American action which will unfold in 1964. *Siempre!* now denounces before the public opinion of our brother countries the aims of the instructions which the ambassadors have received, which prove that:

- 1964 will be a crucial year in the relations of Latin America with the United States.
- The Department of State, through Mr. Mann, has decided that in the present year *there shall be no other Cuba* anywhere, no matter what price must be paid, whether in terms of popular indignation or loss of world prestige by the United States.

THE MANN PLAN FOR LATIN AMERICA IN 1964 HAS BEEN ACTIVATED AND COMPREHENDS THE FOLLOWING:

1. Coup d'état in Uruguay (a)
2. Coup d'état in Brazil (b)
3. Coup d'état in Chile (c)
4. Isolation of Mexico (d)
5. Coup d'état in Cuba (e)

Stages during the year in which these actions will have to take place: (a) January. . . . (b) March-April. (c) September-October. (d) November-December, coinciding with the presidential succession. (e) December-January, 1965.

The actions called for by the plan will be justified in terms of:

I.—The security of the United States.

II.—The instruments signed by the Latin American republics with a view to repressing communism.

The story goes on to say that the first step, a coup in Uruguay (presumably included in the plan because Uruguay still recognizes Cuba) failed. A plot was discovered in time. Details were withheld from the public, "but many military men and even civilians" were arrested.*

The coup in Brazil took place exactly on the reported schedule.

An autumn coup in Chile would be logical: it might either serve to prevent scheduled elections from taking place, or

* That a plot was discovered and arrests made is confirmed by the *Hispanic American Report,* March, 1964, p. 78. According to this account, "Police investigations . . . revealed that the plot should not be taken seriously." It was also noted, however, that "revolts in Uruguay had been considered out of the question for a long time."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to cancel their results should the popular front candidate, Salvador Allende, emerge the victor.

The "isolation of Mexico" of course refers to that country's continued recognition of Cuba. It would presumably be finally accomplished at a meeting of the Organization of American States.

And the same meeting could be assigned the task of setting the stage for the final act of the drama—the coup in Cuba, which in fact of course could only be a more or less thinly disguised United States invasion.

Before leaving the subject of United States policy, we should note that the two recent changes we have been discussing—the abandonment of ALPRO and the encouragement of military take-overs—are closely linked. ALPRO was conceived as a program of reform which would obviate the necessity for revolution. The only alternative is naked counter-revolutionary force. Hence the United States is not only encouraging military take-overs; it is also preparing to give their authors the wherewithal to carry out the task assigned them. Witness the following from a UPI dispatch, dated Washington, April 14:

> Gen. Andrew P. O'Meara, commander of United States forces in the Panama Canal Zone during the recent trouble there, told Congress today that more foreign aid money was needed to strengthen Latin American military forces.
>
> "Every country in Latin America needs continued improvement in its training and equipment to meet the internal security threat facing it," he said. . . .
>
> "Even though the present [foreign aid] program is no greater than last year's," he continued, "I am convinced that the course of future events will require that substantially more of the appropriation be allocated for Latin America than is now proposed." (*New York Times*, April 15. Square brackets in original.)

The Outlook

Let us now go back and pick up the questions which were posed and left unanswered on page 74.

First, will the trend of the past two years toward an increasingly direct role for the military in the governing process continue in the period ahead? All indications point to an affirmative answer. The crises and tensions of semi-colonial so-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ciety are mounting. No effective action to deal with them is possible within the existing social structure. Civilian governments may be tempted to try to go beyond this structure. If they do, the military—backed, supplied, and instigated by the United States—will move in. If they do not, explosions will result and the civilians will be obliged to abdicate to the military or to become mere puppets of the military. In either case, the role of the military seems certain to increase.

This is the general trend. But it needs to be added that it is not necessarily a straight-line trend. Reversions from military to civilian regimes, as in Argentina and Peru during the past year, are not only possible but probable in the future. These reversions serve two important functions, one of which may be called socio-psychological and the other ideological. Military regimes designed to guarantee the status quo obviously cannot solve any of the problems created by that status quo. Tensions therefore go on mounting and are answered by increasingly severe repression. At a certain stage in this process, a reversion to civilian rule accompanied by a let-up in repression can lead not to a real explosion but to a blowing-off of steam and to a more or less prolonged relaxation of tensions—followed in due course by a new round of crises and military interventions. Ideologically, the reversion to civilian rule with its accompanying relaxation of tensions confuses people, arouses hopes that progress can be made without basic change, diverts attention from the root cause of misery and repression, which is not military rule but the entire social order. For all these reasons, a certain alternation between military and civilian rule can be considered to be quite normal. It should not, however, be allowed to obscure the underlying trend which is clearly toward more and more open military rule.

Second question: Can any of the Latin American countries hope to escape being subdued by its own army? Yes, but only on condition that it defeats its own army. It clearly cannot escape simply by electing a left-wing government pledged to basic reforms, as many Chilean radicals seem to believe. Such an event, or even the threat of it, is what is most certain to call forth military intervention: to believe otherwise is to ignore all the lessons of reason and experience. More and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more Chileans are doubtless coming to understand this, especially since the Brazilian coup, and in this lies the hope that a popular front victory in the fall election, which now seems to be a real possibility, would be the beginning of a victory rather than the beginning of a defeat for the Chilean Left. We do not presume to be able to estimate the chances of such a success, but certain positive factors may be noted. The Chilean working class has an excellent record of organization, struggle, and class consciousness, at least as good as that of any other South American country's. In political maturity and ability to act in a disciplined way, it is certainly far ahead of the still relatively backward Brazilian working class. On the other hand, it is not known to have any paramilitary arm. Success would seem to depend on the quality of left-wing leadership, its capacity to stand firm in a crisis, and its ability to attract to its side a significant part of the armed forces, especially of course among the enlisted men.

Third question: Under what conditions can civilian rule be restored and its continuation be guaranteed? The answer to this question is already implicit in the answer to the last one. Civilian rule may from time to time be restored for the reasons already discussed, but its continuation can never be guaranteed until two conditions have been fulfilled: First, the existing military apparatus, which is part and parcel of the semi-colonial social order and the only function of which is to protect that order, must be defeated. In this, armed struggle almost certainly has to play the decisive role, though the potential contribution of division and degeneration within the armed forces should under no circumstances be neglected or minimized. Second, not only must the old military apparatus be defeated; it must also be completely liquidated and dispersed and in its place must be put an *entirely new* military apparatus dedicated to the revolutionary tasks of burying the semi-colonial past and building a socialist future.

We can be the more confident in the correctness of these answers because it has been so solidly confirmed by Cuban experience during the past five years. There Batista's army of occupation was decisively defeated by a combination of armed struggle and internal disintegration. There the old military ap-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

paratus was totally smashed and liquidated. There a new people's army and people's militia were put in its place. There civilian rule was restored and has grown steadily stronger despite the most powerful kind of external pressures and unprecedented internal difficulties. There, above all, the semicolonial past has been buried and the foundations of a socialist future have been laid.

Cuba has proved that all this is possible. The Brazilian coup should go far toward convincing the other peoples of Latin America that they can save themselves from the misery, the shame, the humiliation of their present condition by following, and only by following, the trail which has been so tenaciously and brilliantly blazed by their Cuban brothers.

(May 13, 1964)

BRAZIL: REQUIEM FOR AN ILLUSION

BY PABLO M. ARRIAGA

The first news of the uprising in Brazil against Goulart produced a virtually identical response in Argentine political circles—especially in those on the Left. It can be summed up in a few words: "Civil war is now inevitable. The sharp antagonisms between the opposing forces will not permit Goulart to be ousted without a struggle, as Perón had been."

Later events proved precisely the contrary. How is it possible that the situation was so mistakenly evaluated? What is even worse, we fear that even in Brazil itself very few people suspected that the cataclysm would be so absolute and so swift. This confidence of the Brazilian nationalists in the broad sweep

This article was received after the Review of the Month was completed. Pablo M. Arriaga is the pen name of two young Argentinian socialists.—The Editors

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of their strength spread to the rest of Latin America, and encouraged an expectation of courageous revolutionary attitudes on the part of the leaders of the bourgeoisie toward the oligarchic, semi-fascist Right.

This impression was reinforced by the capitalist press, which for a long time had been presenting an image of a Brazil where, to all intents and purposes, the Left was in control; the unions and the student organizations in the hands of Communists; the famous Peasant Leagues, headed by that demoniacal Castro-ite, Francisco Juliao, inciting the peasants to rebellion; the armed forces sharply divided, the noncommissioned officers fervently nationalist, with a beginning of Sovietization in their ranks; to top it off, the extremist conspiracy was supposed to be headed by none other than the President of the Republic himself. The resulting picture was a terrifying one for the reactionaries and a profoundly satisfying one for the left-wing and popular Latin American forces.

The panorama offered by those committed to the socialist revolution was, of course, a different one. Goulart, they maintained, was a bourgeois who expressed all the contradictions of his class. But, they added, the structure of the country is such as to create a profound conflict of interest between the national bourgeoisie and those groups known by the vague name of the "oligarchy," whose nucleus was formed by the large landowners and those closely linked to *yanqui* imperialism.

The socialist-oriented attributed the supposed Jacobinism of Goulart's followers to several factors: industrial development; the growing consciousness of the masses, who were making their voices heard; the urgent necessity of promoting national capitalist development. Furthermore, they reasoned, the bourgeoisie understood the necessity for a profound structural change for the country to achieve capacity development. Therefore, their alliance with the poorer classes was inevitable; their common enemy was the anti-national interests.

The historic incapacity of the bourgeoisie to carry out the process of national liberation was not denied; but the above reasoning bolstered the idea that "the adventure of the bourgeois revolution" possessed unique characteristics in Brazil that made it extremely important for the rest of Latin America. The

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Communist Party was the principal spokesman for those who maintained that a revolution was being prepared by the men in power, which would permit, with the help of constant popular pressure, its gradual radicalization until—why not?—socialism might be sighted on the horizon. This assessment of the situation is closely linked to one of the fundamental questions that have divided Marxist tendencies since the era of the Stalin-Trotsky polemic up to and including the current Sino-Soviet conflict.

To what degree did the national bourgeoisie fulfill these expectations? In order to answer this question it is necessary first to take into account the importance of the support that was given to the government. Luis Carlos Prestes, Secretary General of the Communist Party stated that "we firmly support the positive aspects of Goulart's policies"; such support takes the form of "working on every level for the unity of democratic forces: workers, peasants, middle classes and national bourgeoisie." (Victor Rico Galán, "The Brazilian Crisis," MONTHLY REVIEW, April 1964.)

The Brazilian CP expected—as many Latin American CP's continue to expect—that under popular pressure the bourgeoisie would not hesitate to take the revolutionary road. Prestes is quoted in the same article as saying, "The growth of the mass movement can bring about a nationalist government." However, history shows that leadership in a coalition of classes of the kind referred to by Prestes invariably remains in the hands of the bourgeoisie, since the tasks of exhortation and organization of the masses are conducted with the aim of exerting gentle pressure on the government to "keep its promises" and carry out the reforms urged by the people. Agitation can never be too thoroughgoing; it must inevitably be restrained in the face of the danger of a coup d'état (a danger often invented by the government itself); demands are dropped; the primary task becomes the issuance of declarations in support of "the national progressive bourgeoisie."

So much for the CP which, by self-definition, should be the most clear-thinking leader of the popular movement. The other popular forces in Brazil were equally put to flight. Worse yet, they all counted on important sectors of the army to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

neutralize any attempt at a coup. The noncommissioned officers' estimate of their own strength is significant. Antonio García Filho, one of their leaders and their parliamentary representative said, with utter conviction: "At the present time we can totally paralyze the Brazilian armed forces." (MR, April 1964.)

Perhaps it was just such an error that caused the government's fall. Of course, the fact that the noncommissioned officers offered virtually no resistance when the coup began was not due to factors like lack of communications, cowardice, etc., but to the lack of revolutionary political leadership that, by mobilizing large masses of the population, could almost certainly have carried along with it a large part of the armed forces. This is, without a doubt, the heart of the problem.

There are many historic examples that demonstrate the behavior of the bourgeoisie in moments of crisis. The groups which sought to defend proletarian and peasant interests should have prepared to fight a civil war. A revolutionary apparatus should have been their constant concern. Had such an apparatus existed, a policy of cooperation with the bourgeoisie on an anti-imperialist program could then have been formulated, but always with the assurance that the apparatus could be counted on to control the situation, even if only in part.

However, as long as there was no group with sufficient clarity on objectives to formulate a clear strategy, it was impossible to set up such an organization. It may be that the problem is a consequence of Brazil's particular political-social characteristics. No political group—not even among those of nationalist-bourgeois ideology—has succeeded in unifying popular sectors under its leadership on a national scale. Such a grouping would have permitted a reaction against the "gorilla" coup, with a probability of success—even if the bourgeoisie were to leave the stage in the middle of the act, abandoning its allies and, in all probability, passing over to the enemy camp.

The combination of domestic circumstances that led Goulart to clash with the Right was reinforced by certain elements of the international scene. The loss of Soviet and *yanqui* authority in their respective areas of influence is common knowledge. It is now possible to institute a few reforms

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

without having, as in the old days, the Marines land on our shores. In general, these reforms do not deal a mortal blow to imperialism; their objective is to prevent a popular explosion. But, let us not forget it, Brazil is the Latin American country that provides, in volume, the largest profits for United States investments. The failure of Kennedy's policy of attempting to encourage a series of reforms in order to check the revolutionary tide led the United States government back to the old device of the "big stick." The first effects of this policy were felt in Panama, but it was the Brazilian situation that caused the policy change to take official form.

Shortly before the Brazilian uprising, Richard Phillips, spokesman for the State Department, declared that the policy of the United States toward unconstitutional governments would thenceforth be based on the national interest, taking into account the particular circumstances of each situation. A word to the wise was sufficient; this was the blessing needed by the reactionaries to unleash their assault. And, as these respectable gentlemen of the Christian West were throwing thousands of trade unionists and others into jail, the President of the United States declared complacently: "It seems to me that this has been a good week for our Hemisphere."

The new State Department attitude toward any attempt to effect more or less profound changes in Latin American political systems is of profound importance if we are to make an accurate prognosis of events to come; this is particularly true for the southern half of the continent.

The groups connected with the *yanqui* oil trust in Argentina, who wield great influence on the high command of the army, already refer, in their publications, to the "Brazilian solution." The formula is clear: a coup d'état, either at the first attempt at reform measures (which the present Argentine government is not inclined to attempt), or in the event of substantial growth of the popular front movement as a reaction to the chaotic deterioration of the economy. In this sense the guerrillas that have recently begun operations in northern Argentina could provide an excellent pretext for applying the "Brazilian solution."

The country that undoubtedly has the most to learn from

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the lesson of Brazil is Chile. Elections will be held in September, and the FRAP has an excellent chance of winning them.* In the face of this situation without precedent in Latin America, one of two things may happen: the Chilean Congress may recognize the minority candidate as president; or—and this is unlikely—it may respect the majority vote and recognize Allende as president. If the latter alternative comes to pass, it is almost a certainty that reactionary forces, protected by the army, will not allow Allende to assume the presidency. And in the event that this happens we assert, on the basis of personal knowledge of the Chilean situation, that popular forces will not be ready to lead an organized movement capable of imposing the popular will. They will not even be able to win one of those honorable defeats that are the beginning of a long process of revolutionary war. This is due to the fact that many Chileans believe, as many Brazilians believed, that the bourgeoisie will respect electoral results and that the legality-minded army will enforce such respect.

It is well to remember, before it is too late, what happened in Brazil, Guatemala, Argentina (Perón), and Bolivia. These events teach us a lesson that the Latin American peoples are, to their profit, learning daily, especially since the Cuban Revolution: *national liberation can be won only with arms in hand, by a close knit popular organization that will see to it that the movement's objectives are carried out without vacillation.* There is no other solution. This is the principal lesson of the Brazilian experience. How many dreams must yet be shattered before we learn this historic truth?

* FRAP—*Frente Revolucionario de Acción Popular,* an alliance of several workers' parties in Chile, the two principal parties being the Communist and the Socialist. The Socialist leader, Salvador Allende, is FRAP presidential candidate in the September elections.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE AFRO-ASIAN PEOPLES AND LATIN AMERICA

BY GREGORIO GOLDENBERG

The Sixth Session of the Organization of Solidarity Among Afro-Asian Peoples (OPSAA), held in Algiers during the last week in March, elevated to priority status the problem of unification and the closing of ranks in the peoples' common struggle against imperialism and old- and new-style colonialism. The Cuban observer—as well as other Latin American observers—reiterated the necessity for close ties between the Afro-Asian organization and Latin American anti-imperialist groups. He expressed Havana's readiness to participate in a conference of peoples of the three continents.

In the organization's official report, the Secretary General, Youssef El-sebai, spoke of solidarity with the Latin American peoples as follows:

> As we Afro-Asian peoples build solidarity among ourselves, we reaffirm our support for and solidarity with the peoples of Latin America in their struggle against United States imperialism and for complete national independence. Once again we declare our support for the heroic Cuban people in its determination to defend national sovereignty and safeguard its revolutionary conquests.

The report also expressed support for "the heroic struggle of the Panamanian people against United States aggression, in defense of national sovereignty, and for the return of the Panama Canal."

Already the Third Conference of Solidarity Among Afro-Asian Peoples, held in Moshi, Tanganyika, in February, 1963, had adopted the important "Resolution on Afro-Asian-Latin American Solidarity and Cooperation"; furthermore its "Po-

---

Gregorio Goldenberg is a Chilean who went to Cuba in 1960 and is now correspondent for *Prensa Latina* in Peking. The translation is by Bobbye Ortiz.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

litical Resolution" included a paragraph on Latin American struggles against imperialism and colonialism, and another on the struggle of the Cuban people in particular. It was not mere chance that these resolutions were proposed and passed. The long struggle of the peoples of the three continents has enabled them to understand that all have a common enemy, and they have at last reached the conclusion that it is necessary and advantageous to collaborate closely.

The history of Latin America, like that of the Afro-Asian countries, throws light on this new development in the peoples' struggle: centuries of colonial domination; economic, cultural, and social underdevelopment; over-exploitation of natural resources and of the working masses—all these common elements, and many others, have established a kinship among the populations of the three continents, a kinship more clearly recognized during the last few years. Out of it has come at last a sentiment of solidarity, which acts as a common weapon, a battering ram, in their struggles.

At the same time important differences exist. First, the wars of independence fought by Latin Americans against the imperial power, Spain, and currently the popular struggles of our day against foreign domination, so gloriously exemplified by the Cuban people's fight—both of these chapters of history can perhaps throw light on the struggles of the Afro-Asian peoples. We propose to deal here with some of these events, analyzing them in the light of the Second Declaration of Havana.

The United Nations proclaimed 1960 to be "African Year." During the Fifteenth General Assembly held in the course of that year, more than ten new African states were accepted into membership. Many heads of state were present on that occasion, and for several days Assembly sessions were devoted to speeches welcoming the new member states; chiefs of mission from the most dissimilar nations vied with each other in their praise: representatives of the colonial powers and of independent nations, of the United States and of the Dominican Republic. Portugal saluted Mali's independence without uttering a word on the subject of Mozambique or Angola, Great Britain welcomed Sierra Leone but scrupulously

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

avoided any mention of British Guiana or Zanzibar. France gave the appearance of being the most magnanimous of all the colonial powers; after all, the majority of the new member states had once been part of its colonial empire. But the French delegation left the meeting hall when embattled Algeria was discussed. And outside the imposing UN edifice, the flags of fourteen new member states waved, symbolizing fourteen "independent nations."

In that same General Assembly, as in all others since the founding of the UN, the Latin American nations were present, constituting—as if by magic—a bloc; this was United States imperialism's "contribution" to the "peace" proposals of the UN. Some Latin American delegates added their voices to the chorus of welcome to the "young republics" who had just won their independence on the African continent, and sang their praises on the occasion of their initiation into the "family of free nations."

None of them mentioned Puerto Rico, Yankee colony in the Caribbean; none of them spoke of the Dutch, French, and British colonies in the American Hemisphere. And the delegate from Paraguay dared to present as an "example of democracy" the bloody dictatorship which controls his country, thanks to the support of the State Department. The flags of the Latin American nations have been waving at the UN for more than eighteen years: all of them are considered to be "free and independent nations."

The case of Algeria was put on the agenda of the General Assembly for the sixth consecutive time in 1960. The presence of fourteen new African states encouraged the hope that this body would at last adopt a resolution recognizing Algeria's right to independence, to the independence for which its people had been fighting for six years, against the NATO-backed, powerful French army. In actual fact the Algerians expected nothing more of the UN than the recognition of their right of self-determination and an agreement on procedure for carrying out a referendum in which the people could express their opinion freely, without the pressure implicit in the presence of some 800,000 army parachutists, gendarmes, and French police. Even the French government itself had already expressed, how-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ever vaguely, its determination to reach an agreement with the Algerian people.

However, when the time came to discuss the case of Algeria, eleven African nations presented an amendment to the resolution, which would have attempted to repeat in Algeria the sad experience of the Congo (Leopoldville) by putting the fate of the Algerian people into the hands of a UN organism. The amendment was subsequently rejected; Algeria's right to self-determination was upheld by an overwhelming majority of votes; there were only eight votes against, *seven of which were cast by African nations, six of them new members of the UN.*

During the same General Assembly, Fidel Castro presented, in the name of the Cuban people, a solidly documented denunciation of aggression against Cuba by the United States government. The speech made by Cuba's Prime Minister is today considered to be of historic importance. Never before had the representative of a Latin American nation spoken out so vigorously, supporting his accusations with forceful arguments and irrefutable proofs. Some one hundred delegates heard Fidel Castro charge that aggressions had already been committed and that a new aggression was in preparation; he succeeded in winning the unanimous approbation of those present. This occurred at the end of September 1960. Half a year later, in April 1961, the mercenary forces trained, financed, and transported by the United States government disembarked at Playa Girón; the fate of this expedition is known to all. History itself had proved the truth of Fidel Castro's allegations.

Nevertheless, Cuba's resolution of indictment was voted down by the General Assembly. The imperialist United States won the votes of, among others, the majority of Latin American countries. Among those who voted against Cuba were those countries that had themselves been victimized by Yankee aggression, as well as a number of African nations. The experience of both Algeria and Cuba in the UN proved that the title of "independent nation," the possession of a flag, the presence of representatives in international organizations, in no way signify the existence of genuine national independence. The shadow of neo-colonialist dependency was visible. This aspect of reality is well understood by the peoples of Latin America, Asia, and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Africa, who are also only too well aware of how little "international organizations" can offer in the defense of popular interests, the right of self-determination, peace, and international security.

II

The revolutionary upheavals that are proliferating on the African continent today, shaking colonialism to its foundations, spread through Latin America a century and a half ago. Spanish exploitation of South America on the one hand and Napoleon Bonaparte's conquest of Spain on the other provided the background for the struggles to shake off the colonial yoke. The revolutionary ideas of the Encyclopedists and the French Revolution of 1789 reached the shores of this exploited continent. From one end of Latin America to the other, the people rose up in arms against foreign domination.

After some ten years of struggle, Spain was ejected from Latin America, and a dozen new, free, and independent states came into being. Constituent assemblies were set up and the advisability of republican forms of government was discussed. Within a few years national flags, national anthems, and national governments had proliferated. In Europe, toward which the new nations looked for examples to guide them, the bourgeoisie was putting the finishing touches on a new kind of state, the bourgeois state. Consequently, the American nations imitated many of its innovations, without regard for the profound developmental differences between European and Latin American nations.

In other words, a group of bourgeois states with republican trappings was established in America, while the dominant colonial structure of their economies was maintained. Latin Americans soon discovered that in terms of poverty, exploitation, and backwardness, their lives were changed only minimally. The master remained entrenched, the social structure remained unchanged. A *criollo* [full-blooded Spaniard born in Latin America] minority, which formerly had to share its profits with a colonial power, continued to enrich itself through exploitation of the people, the sole difference being that it now constituted the ruling caste. This *criollo* minority had long served the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Spanish Empire; it would be easy enough, later, to transfer its allegiance to the Dollar Empire.

The revolutionary principles for which the Latin American people had shed their blood were eclipsed by the self-seeking of the *criollo* ruling class, now completely at the service of United States imperialism. Wherever it was difficult to crush the revolutionary spirit of the peoples, the bloodiest military dictatorships in modern history established and perpetuated themselves. If the Spanish colonizers wiped out millions of Indians in only a few years, their feats were more than equalled by the butchery of the bandits who occupied the seats of power in Central American countries, Venezuela, Colombia, Peru, and Paraguay. A handful of alleged "democratic" principles, interpreted by the ruling oligarchies as they saw fit, was sufficient to lull the peoples of the other Latin American nations, which even today boast of their "state institutions," their "constitutionality," their "respect for the law."

Held in servitude on the great latifundia of Latin America, the peasant masses who form the overwhelming majority of the population endure life at a level of backwardness and poverty that is incompatible with human existence. Respect for human life is meaningless in those latitudes, where infant mortality and early death from curable diseases decimate the population, which at best can hope to reach little more than the age of thirty, according to life expectancy figures for the continent. Was this the goal for which their ancestors fought, alongside Bolívar, Sucre, San Martín, O'Higgins, and Miranda?

The Spanish imperial power, when it entrenched itself on the American continent more than four centuries ago, hardly had to dispute its occupation of this vast territory with other colonial powers. When an expedition leader of the Spanish forces decided to settle in a given locality, the area was given the status of a viceroyship; subsequently, and with complete disregard for ethnological, linguistic, or national factors, the lands were artificially divided. The process of "Balkanization" was already well known on the American continent long before the name was invented. Even now, this artificial division continues to divide tribes that were originally united—such is the case of the Quechua Indians, for example, now inhabiting three

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

countries. It sows the seed of discord and provokes border disputes, which today serve so admirably the neo-colonialist aims of United States imperialism. Since Latin America threw off the Spanish yoke, the wars on its soil have been numerous—wars originating in this artificial and arbitrary division of the map.

During these one hundred and fifty years of "independent" existence, the Latin American nations have undergone some degree of economic development, but in virtually every case it has redounded to the benefit of the new foreign master who exploits their natural resources and their people. Mining and single-crop cultivation are widespread; the corollary is economic dependence on United States imperialism, the only beneficiary. Social and cultural retardation prevail, as in other countries subjected to colonial domination.

If one compares the situation of Latin American peasants with that of Africans and Asians still living under colonialism, it will be seen that the "independence" wrested from Spain a century and a half ago—in a struggle as heroic as it was unequal—has indeed brought the Latin American little. Haiti's population is 95 percent illiterate; Bolivian and Chilean miners have an active-life span of twenty years; the peasants of Northeast Brazil form an endless migratory stream, as they flee from the hunger that pursues them. Are there not similar situations in Africa? And do not the small Indian communities scattered along the slopes of the Andes live in the same isolation as do many Asian villages?

America—Spanish-speaking America—seemingly freed itself from colonialism more than a century and a half ago; and yet it presents a picture of hunger and poverty comparable to that of Asia and Africa, which are only now engaging in the struggle for freedom.

III

It was in tribute to "democracy" that Latin America sacrificed the prices of its raw materials during the Second World War. The same devotion led the peoples of Asia and Africa to spill their blood in defense of imperialists engaged in a clash over the redivision of the world. Victory over fascism,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

however, provoked an upheaval on the two exploited continents, just as the French Revolution had done, more than one hundred fifty years ago, in Latin America.

At the end of the war the Afro-Asian peoples began to ask themselves just what kind of democracy they had been fighting for if their rights as free peoples were now being denied them. The colonialist powers, members of the newly organized United Nations, spoke eloquently in defense of the principles of self-determination, while a mechanical majority approved Yankee intervention in Korea. The flag of the United Nations was stained with blood at Panmunjon, just as it was, subsequently, in the Congo.

Postwar history, as viewed from the Asian and African continents, is characterized by a multiplicity of aggressions, no less bloody than those committed in the earliest days of colonialism. Kenya and Vietnam, Malaya and Algeria, Oman and Angola; Yankee intervention in the Chinese People's War of Liberation; the aggression in Korea; the bombardment of Bizerte, following upon the massacre of Sakiet-Sidi el Youssef; intervention in the Congo and Cyprus. All these events parallel the existence of the United Nations, with its pompous declarations in defense of the "rights of man," self-determination of peoples, and small nations.

If we take into account the events which occurred in Asia and Africa between the Bandung Conference of 1955 and the March, 1964, session of the OPSAA, we cannot experience the least surprise at the conclusions reached at the latter conference. As the Afro-Asians have time and again insisted, they are lovers of peace, enemies of violence as an end. But the reality of the historic moment in which they live has taught them that there is no alternative to armed struggle in the defense or conquest, as the case may be, of their independence. Life has shown them that neo-colonialism stops at nothing; it will resort to large-scale massacre and political assassination; it will resort to bribery and open military intervention.

Lumumba in the Congo, Mumié in Cameroun, Bandaranaike in Ceylon, Quinim Pholsena in Laos are only a few of the patriots and leaders who have fallen, assassinated, in the past few years because they blocked the advance of neo-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

colonialism. Kenyatta, Gizenga, Babu, Joshua Nkomo, and many other African leaders have known jails and prisons, and continue to fill the detention centers of the Sudan, Angola, "Portuguese" Guinea, South Africa, etc. The list is inevitably incomplete; there are many whose whereabouts is not known.

The resettlement camps of Algiers and the "strategic hamlets" of present-day South Vietnam had their antecedents in the war unleashed by the British imperialists against the people of Malaya; they represent nothing more than variations of the same reactionary policies. In spite of the manifest and increasingly acute contradictions among imperialist powers, especially aggravated by United States dreams of world domination, the forces of reaction form a common front against the peoples' struggles and give each other mutual aid toward this end. The most recent example is the discussions between Johnson and Lord Home at the end of 1963, in which the British government committed itself to aid the United States in South Vietnam in exchange for American aid in Malaysia.

But we have not reached the end of the story. The scattered local forces of reaction which serve imperialism on all continents have formed shock troops for the repression of national liberation movements. There are Chiang Kai-shek's cohorts, employed by U.S. imperialism in Southeast Asia; there is the Foreign Legion; there are the brigades of mercenaries recruited to fight in the Congo or Cuba. The dregs of society are being put to full use by the enemies of the peoples of the entire world.

But such techniques of repression were discredited long ago. It is now more fashionable to serve in the "United Nations forces." But even this device has been exposed by the people, and after the wars of Yankee intervention in Korea and the Congo, the peoples of Asia and Africa view with growing terror the role of the UN in the international arena; the current intervention in Cyprus confirms their apprehensions.

In what was formerly French Indo-China the picture is even clearer. The Yankee imperialists maintain a chaotic situation in Laos, impeding the neutrality commitments of that nation, hampering the functioning of its coalition government. Cambodia suffers constant aggressions; its territorial integrity

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and its very existence as an independent nation are threatened. In South Vietnam an undeclared war is under way, with direct participation of American troops. The defense of these three nations has been undertaken by the peoples themselves, and the impetus of their struggle for liberation and national sovereignty is increasing; it has, in fact, increased sharply since the American warmakers began to make threats to extend the war to the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. Kennedy's famous "peace speeches," his many "aid plans," his "Peace Corps," have been completely exposed by the activities of the Yankee imperialists, and the people now know the road they must take if they are to conquer and defend their independence and sovereignty.

IV

Which path must they take? The path of armed struggle. The example of the Latin American peoples' struggles for their "second" independence may well throw light on the Afro-Asian peoples' struggles for the definitive conquest of their political and economic independence.

The Latin American peoples not only served as a very early laboratory experiment in "Balkanization." During their years of pseudo-independence, the manifold forms of its economic bondage have been exposed; and if this were not sufficient, they have also witnessed the role of "military pacts" and "hemispheric defense." Their shackles are both economic and military.

The Cuban Revolution has pointed to the way out of this blind alley. Challenging "geographic fatalism," that characteristically fascist concept, and challenging an army lavishly equipped for popular repression, Fidel mobilized an entire people who then proceeded to rid their small country of an enemy that boasted of its omnipotence. After five victorious years the Cuban Revolution stands as an example which all the power of Yankee imperialism has not been able to destroy. It is indeed an illuminating example, and not only for Latin America. The September, 1960, Declaration of Havana included the following sentences:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The National General Assembly of the People of Cuba affirms:

The duty of workers, peasants, students, intellectuals, Negroes, Indians, youth, women, the aged, to fight for their economic, political and social rights;

The duty of oppressed and exploited nations to fight for their liberation;

The duty of every people to make common cause with all other oppressed, exploited, colonized, and victimized peoples wherever they live, regardless of geographical separation.

All peoples of the world are brothers!

The Cuban Revolution has understood that counter-revolutionary activity is indivisible, and that the struggle of the peoples for their liberation is also indivisible. The Second Declaration of Havana (1962) includes the following paragraph:

What is the history of Cuba but the history of Latin America? And what is the history of Latin America but the history of Asia, Africa, and Oceania? And what is the history of all these peoples but the history of the most pitiless and cruel exploitation throughout the world?

The heroic battles of the Cuban Revolution against United States imperialism have shown clearly where the enemy is to be found and how he disguises himself. Imperialism, unmasked, has shown its true face in Cuba; it is a face that is also recognized by the oppressed and exploited peoples of Asia and Africa. The significance of two-faced imperialist policy—a policy calling for the olive branch in one hand and assassin's weapons in the other—becomes clearer daily.

The counter-revolutionary tactic of discoursing on peace and democracy while engaged in slaughtering the peoples had still another facet in Africa and Asia. The colonial powers went to these continents on "civilizing missions." In the wake of the armies of occupation and extermination came the missionaries to convert the "savage" peoples. Near the mission, the contractor of slave labor would set up his headquarters. The settlers arrived later, after "pacification." This "pacification" operation has not yet been exhaustively studied, but it is sufficient to point out the incredible fact that *the population of*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Congo has actually diminished since Belgian colonization began, late in the nineteenth century—a fact that can only be explained by a policy of systematic extermination.

It is not easy to calculate the enormous wealth removed from the Congo during these 60 years of Belgian rule, just as it is impossible to calculate the amount of gold and diamonds removed by the foreign masters of the South African workers, whose reward has been—*apartheid*. Has the fate of the African peoples been substantially different from that of the Guaraní Indians, the Motilones, the Vapichanas? The annihilation of entire African populations that fell under the "civilizing" rule of the colonialist powers is basically the same fate suffered by the peoples of America—including the prideful North America, which today provides humiliating "reservations" for the first inhabitants of its territory.

The extermination of some for the enrichment of others; the destruction of many for the benefit of a group of monopolists —such has been the common destiny reserved for the continents which fell under colonial domination.

"One thousand dollars per death, four times per minute,"* is the formula established in the Second Declaration of Havana for the relationship of exploiter and exploited in Latin America, as a result of United States imperialist exploitation of the continent. If it were a matter of determining a parallel equation for Africa and Asia, we would have to gird ourselves for greater, more horrifying surprises, however shocking and overwhelming the Latin American statistics may seem. No war among nations has produced such statistics, and yet never before the Second Declaration had a mighty voice been raised to spell out in letters of fire the systematic genocide practiced for centuries by the imperialist powers.

The lessons have not been easy, but the peoples have learned them at last. The existence of a world socialist system,

* This formula is derived from the following passage in the Second Declaration of Havana: ". . .on this continent of semi-colonies about four persons per minute die of hunger, of curable illnesses or premature old age, five thousand five hundred per day. . . . Meanwhile, from Latin America a continuous torrent of money flows to the United States: some $4,000 a minute."—Ed.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the progress made in barely a generation by peoples who had been exploited and colonized, the examples of the popular revolutions of our times, all these carry an irresistible weight on the contemporary international scene. They stimulate the struggle of the colonial peoples who are learning how to put an end to their economic and cultural lags, their poverty, and how to build a new life, worthy of human beings.

"It is the duty of every revolutionary to make the revolution," says the Second Declaration of Havana. "We know that the revolution will triumph in America and throughout the world; but it is not for revolutionaries to sit at their doorsteps waiting to see the corpse of imperialism pass by." These simple conclusions have penetrated the conscience of the peoples the world over, and the revolutionary tide rises steadily.

In yet another way the Latin American experience is relevant to the Afro-Asian peoples' struggle. Due to specific conditions in Africa, where tribal organization still exists—which was and is fully utilized by the imperialist powers for their own benefit—and where religious superstitions find fertile ground in the cultural lag among these peoples, the following paragraph of the Second Declaration of Havana has special significance:

> Division, a product of all kinds of prejudices, false ideas, and lies; sectarianism, dogmatism, lack of broadness in analyzing the role of all social strata, their parties, organizations, and leaders, hinder the indispensable unity of action of democratic and progressive forces among our peoples. They are flaws of growth, infantile disorders of the revolutionary movement, which must be eliminated.

This is a lesson that the people have learned and are still learning, at great sacrifice, at the cost, even, of reverses in the struggle. "Imperialists and colonialists," says the Political Resolution adopted by the Moshi Solidarity Conference of Afro-Asian Peoples, "have recently resorted to a new, veiled form of domination—the transfer of power to the hands of corrupt and traitorous agents." The Conference's reasons for including this warning in its Political Resolution are obvious. The warning is equally valid for Latin America, where the presence of these "corrupt and traitorous agents" has, time and again, made a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mockery of the peoples' longings for democracy and liberation.

For too long the majority of the population of one continent was unaware of living conditions on the other continents and of the bonds that unite them all. The times in which we live are sweeping away divisions deliberately sown by imperialist powers, and with every day that passes former links are established. Comprehension of our common problems and tasks is increasing. The solidarity conferences of the Afro-Asians have served to bring us even closer together; they have also underscored the need for Latin American solidarity organizations similar to those created by the Afro-Asians since Bandung. We Latin Americans will then be able to participate, not merely as observers but as full-fledged delegates, in future Afro-Asian peoples' solidarity meetings, forming a common front in the struggle against both old- and new-style imperialism.

From Mount Turquino in Cuba to Mount Kilimanjaro in Africa a popular and revolutionary flood is irrevocably mounting; it is a flood that cannot be dammed. Men have begun to set off a chain reaction far more potent and formidable than that produced in an atomic explosion. This mighty human force, the Second Declaration of Havana tells us, "has begun to march. Its giant steps will not be halted until true independence is won—for which goal many have died in vain. Today, however, those who die will die like the Cubans at Playa Girón, fighting for their own, genuine, everlasting independence."

THREE BOOKS at HALF-PRICE
by
SCOTT NEARING

THE BRAVE NEW WORLD — list price $3.50
USA TODAY — list price $3.50
MAN'S SEARCH for the GOOD LIFE — list price $1.50

These three books (list price $8.50) Sent for $4 postpaid

SOCIAL SCIENCE INSTITUTE
Harborside, Maine

(advertisement)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DEBUNKING THE DEBUNKER

BY GUNTHER ANDERS

As the publishers of *Burning Conscience* we felt we should reply to the attack on Claude Eatherly in William Bradford Huie's book *The Hiroshima Pilot*. We therefore asked Günther Anders, co-author of *Burning Conscience* to take up the various issues involved. We print below Anders' reply.—The Editors

For weeks now the globe has been flooded with the news about an allegedly sensational book. The thesis with which its author, William Bradford Huie, wishes to shake the world, is that the Hiroshima Pilot, Claude Eatherly, who has been dramatized in newspaper articles, poems, books, TV shows and plays, is really nothing but a petty swindler who has never dreamt of repenting Hiroshima; no, that it wasn't even *he* who dropped the bomb. Some of the readers of these lines may remember that I, too, am involved in this affair. In 1959 (very late, for at that time Eatherly was already well known and had already been made the subject of literary treatment), a correspondence between Claude and myself developed. Now, since this correspondence has appeared in many languages, and since in one of my letters (Number 5), I called him the antipode to Eichmann, I cannot deny being one of those responsible for the fact that he is now playing a role symbolic for the moral situation of today. Reason enough for Mr. Huie to use me, too, as a funny figure in his shooting gallery.

How good a shot is he?

The sensational news that Eatherly did not bomb Hiroshima hits into the very center of the blue, for Eatherly has never claimed that he did. If there is anything sensational about this "debunking," it is the sensational ignorance of the correspondents. As a matter of fact, the version which today is making its way around the world as the discovery of Mr. Huie is identical with the description which Eatherly himself has given of his indirect role as a weather scouting pilot (*Burning Conscience*, Letter 42).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As to Mr. Huie's suggestion that repentance could not possibly have taken place because Eatherly hadn't actually committed the deed, this betrays a moral blindness rare even in our age of blindness—and blindness concerning not only this special case, but concerning *the* moral problem of today. For what is illustrated by the Eatherly case is precisely the fateful fact that man today can become "guiltlessly guilty" through participating in actions, the purpose of which remains obscure to him, and the effects of which are so enormous that he is no longer able to visualize them; in other words: that it is just this seeming harmlessness of "co-acting" which threatens him with the danger of becoming guilty. It is at best naive to accord the right to be horrified, or to repent, only to those who happen to press the *last* button, the last one which provokes the fall of the bomb—thus, to place the moral onus exclusively upon the last link of the chain of action. But it is this which Mr. Huie, without being able to formulate it theoretically, is implying. It is needless to add that to argue in this way amounts to defending Eichmann who, after all, never touched an Auschwitz oven. While Mr. Huie does not see this issue, Eatherly, who is not a theorist either, has recognized the point. In a TV broadcast arranged for him and for some of his Hiroshima buddies ("Brinkley Journal," December 10, 1962), he declared (and, of course, was the only one), that he would never again take part in an enterprise the effects of which would be of such an unimaginable magnitude. I leave it open whether it is a coincidence that this fact which, biographically, is everything but unimportant, is not to be found in Mr. Huie's book, while, on the other hand, the most private details about Claude and his wife are served on a pseudo-scientific silver platter to the reader. There are no surer means of making one's fellow men ridiculous than by undressing them in public.

There are hundreds who today write about Eatherly, but only a few (to whom Mr. Huie belongs, too) have ever seen him. I know him. Three years ago I spent a week together with him. And here is my impression: nothing would be more misleading than to present him as the born fanatic or the professional martyr. He is a Texas boy who, coming from a drab farm life, suddenly rose to the glamorous and reckless career

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of an Air Force officer; and who, as shown by his odd excursions into the criminal and sham-criminal, has hardly found his way back into the normality and inconspicuousness of everyday life. No man, however, is but *one* man. In the very moment in which I mentioned Hiroshima, he became a completely different being, he became the Claude from whom I had received such moving letters. Tact and consideration forbid me to describe his breakdown in detail. If swindling and simulating look like this, then Eatherly is famous for the wrong reason, for then he is the greatest actor in history, an actor who plays his part so powerfully and with such hair-raising intensity that he remains unable to recover from it for hours.

But even Mr. Huie doesn't confine himself to the simulation version. His main argument is that during the first years after the war, Claude allegedly never mentioned Hiroshima; that he did so only later; only because he gradually became—this is not Mr. Huie's term—the image of his image; that he adapted himself to the picture which movie writers, poets, philosophers, etc., had drawn of him. Now, I myself am not an Eatherly biographer; I confined myself to the modest task of trying to help him. So let's have recourse to Mr. Huie. According to him, Claude's literary treatment began in 1957. On the other hand, our great analyst claims to prove—his psychological naiveté is such that he believes himself *to be able* to demonstrate that another man's emotion has existed or not existed years ago—that Claude had never regretted Hiroshima. From this he draws the conclusion that the whole repentance business is nothing but an imitation of the "myth" made up by writers. But is that really so? Poor Mr. Huie refutes himself. For he is careless enough casually to publish Dr. Constantine's words that Claude spoke to him about his Hiroshima guilt as early as 1956! Mr. Huie, this means: one year *before* anyone had dreamt of using Claude as the hero of a literary piece.

But even if, for the sake of argument, we assume that Mr. Huie is right in both respects: the Eatherly's Hiroshima fixation broke out only years after, and that Claude is the copy of the image drawn by other people—would that prove anything? The assumption that reactions must follow as promptly as thunder follows lightning again betrays Mr. Huie's almost

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

incredible psychological clumsiness. Obviously Mr. Huie has never heard of "latency periods" known to every college freshman; and, of course, he could suspect Mr. Allen Dulles who, as we know, needed seventeen years (UPI, April 28, 1962) before he publicly expressed his conviction of the needlessness of the Hiroshima action for the same reason; not to speak of St. Paul. Furthermore as everybody will remember, criticizing the Hiroshima action in the first postwar years belonged to those things which were considered almost unthinkable; and almost tabu, at least for those who came from such a non-intellectual and conformistic stratum as Claude—not to speak of Texas, which, as I learned lately, is not exactly the most unprejudiced state in the United States.

Finally, as to the reproach that Claude has fashioned himself after the image drawn by others, this is *the* everyday process, particularly in conformistic societies: the "become what others expect you to be" has universally replaced Goethe's "become yourself" (*"werde der du bist"*). However, even if Claude's "becoming" the Claude image were true, it would contradict the mechanism of conformistic society, since the image to which he allegedly chose to conform is anything but the generally accepted ideal of every red-blooded American boy. On the contrary, most red-blooded Americans defame this ideal as being that of bloody red Americans. Thus even his "conforming" would testify to his independence and his nonconformism. But why should we continue with such purely hypothetical deliberations? What really counts is the position which Claude actually takes today. And here we need not rely upon assumptions. Proof is not only his collapse in Mexico City, not only his correspondence with me, but also his (still unpublished) autobiography. Let's conclude the Eatherly chapter with his own words (p. 172): "I don't know why I'm the only participant on that mission to have been deeply disturbed by it. . . . I don't give a damn how insignificant my role was. The fact is, I played it."

Now who is this Mr. Huie, who is so eager, for the sake of "truth"—one of his pet words—to debunk Eatherly? Whoever studies other texts of this author must be speechless when

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

confronted with his self-portrait in the *Hiroshima Pilot*. There he introduces himself as being nothing but a reporter, not a political essayist, and as having warm sympathies with pacifists. On whose ignorance did he speculate when drawing this picture of himself? For Mr. Huie is, as a first glance at his writings has taught me, not only a well-known political essayist, but also the author of novels and "true stories" which, incidentally, are offered to his readers bound in glossy covers with appetizing pictures of sex and murder. But he has gained his greatest reputation as an advocate of the American Air Force. His book *The Fight for Air Power* has certainly been one of the most effective propaganda pieces written for the build-up of the Air Force. General Hugh Knerr, with whom he wrote the book, is, in Mr. Huie's own words, the man who "contributed more . . . to the development of the . . . B29" than any other man. What a rare coincidence! First he worked together with one of the key constructors of the B29; and then he depicts as a miserable good for nothing, the man who, through repenting, criticizes the triumph of the B29: the Hiroshima Mission. And how odd that he, who, in his *Hiroshima Pilot,* never tires of stressing his absolutely independent research work in the interest of truth, reported in his *The Case Against the Admirals* (p. 22) that he had succeeded in a venture in which even General Arnold had failed: namely in being "responsible" for the restoration of Hugh Knerr as lieutenant colonel. "I had been responsible for his restoration. . . I had succeeded." I must humbly confess—for the sake of truth—that in the solitude of my writing room, I have never achieved anything comparable to this feat.

The Case Against the Admirals represents one of the decisive literary documents in the fight between the branches of the armed forces. It reaches its climax in Mr. Huie's suggestion to launch preventive aggression against Russia, China, and India, which countries Mr. Huie (the merits of his linguistic creativity should get the praise it deserves) lumps together under the name of *Chindia*.

Now to his activities connected with the *American Mercury*: As is generally known, this once highly reputed Mencken magazine later became the mouthpiece of McCarthy politics, and it was during this period that Mr. Huie functioned as its

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

editor-in-chief. Since it is impossible here to quote copiously from his contributions and those of his collaborators, we have to confine ourselves to a few random samples. We read, for instance, that Acheson was a paid agent of Stalin (September 1952); that "Truman is an habitual liar" (August 1951); that Roosevelt's advisors "have labored to convert America into the monolithic, one-party, socialistic state" (October 1951). And to have the picture made complete, we need only to look at the method with which Mr. Huie guaranteed the survival of his magazine when it ran into financial difficulties. For in this emergency, he took recourse to the millionaire, J. Russell Maguire, who (according to *Time* of December 8, 1952) supported a book which is "the most extensive piece of racist propaganda in the history of the anti-Semitic movement in America" and who was forced out of Wall Street for "flagrant violations" of the law. Whoever wishes to have Mr. Huie's portrait adorned further with a flourish needs only to read *Time* of June 30, 1949, where he can find the report about Mr. Huie's attempt to sell the sensational story of a uranium theft to the *New York Daily News*—a story which the FBI dismissed with the words "no espionage involved in this case."

Of course, in such a preliminary report, it is impossible to enumerate all (to put it politely) errors to be found in *Hiroshima Pilot*. However a few examples should be presented in order to convey at least an inkling of what is offered in this book, what has been accepted by most reviewers at face value and what, in the near future, will be fed to the European reader, too. He confers, for instance, nobility on my friend, the writer, Robert Jungk, whom he calls "Von Robert Jungk." Obviously because he mistakes the *eingeleitet von Robert Jungk* ("introduced by Robert Jungk") on the title page of the German edition of *Burning Conscience* for a title of nobility. I must confess this mistake makes me highly sceptical about his assurance that he has "studied," or is able to study, the German version of the correspondence. On another page, he accidentally slides into his second, less dangerous, profession, into that of the novelist: for he contends that I had reported around the world that Claude has flown for Israel. This really proves the admirable inventiveness of the fiction writer, for this contention

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is not stained by the tiniest crumb of reality. I never did report that. Or we read that in Mexico City I had warned Eatherly against him, although at that time—happy and unimaginable days!—his existence was still unknown to me. Besides there are those passages which are beyond truth and untruth, but which clearly betray the mentality and the level of the author. There is, for instance, the observation, meant to fry the egg-head, that while modest reporters like him are interested only in truth, "philosophers . . . have ideas to sell . . . and cases to make." What a contempt for his readers when he expects them to enjoy such a sparkling remark. And what a contempt for himself to speculate on the applause of those who enjoy such remarks.

Jokes aside. What Mr. Huie is aiming at in his book can be condensed in a few short sentences. By "demonstrating" that the man who says he repents Hiroshima is a swindler, he hopes to prove:

- that it is a swindle to repent Hiroshima;
- that there is nothing to be repented about Hiroshima;
- that only swindlers repent such things;
- that normal people do not repent such things.

Of course, this is pseudo-logic. But, as the echoes have shown, a very powerful one.

The echoes. With this word I come to the most shattering chapter of the whole affair. For the numerous echo voices have one tone in common: the tone of jubilation. Let's pause for a moment to think over what this means.

It means: people gloatingly welcome the alleged fact that the antipode to Eichmann: the man who was horrified because he had participated in a monstrous action, does *not* exist, has *never* existed, and that the whole Eatherly affair is nothing but a hoax. If Mr. Huie were right, the only adequate reaction would be grief.

It has been said about Eatherly—whether rightly so or not does not matter here—that he cried out in his sleep because he believed he heard the screams of the burning children of Hiroshima. Shouldn't *we* cry out in our sleep because we have heard "repentance was a swindle" as a collective shout of triumph?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR'S FIFTEENTH ANNIVERSARY

The fifteenth anniversary of the founding of MONTHLY REVIEW was celebrated at a most successful "birthday party" at the Park Sheraton Hotel in New York on Wednesday, May 13th. Barrows Dunham acted as master of ceremonies, and speakers included, in addition to the editors and Scott Nearing, Lorraine Hansberry, H. H. Wilson, Carey McWilliams and Corliss Lamont. E. Y. Harburg, assisted by an able supporting cast which included young singers from a Brooklyn high school, entertained with songs and poems, one of which he wrote especially for the occasion. A highlight of the evening was the announcement by Louise Berman, chairman of the volunteer committee which organized the meeting, that the campaign to raise money to send MR Press books to Negro college libraries brought in $7,428.

The committee invited to the meeting all the authors whose writings have appeared in MR since the beginning. Many were present, but many of course could not make it. A number of MR authors living abroad sent special greetings which were read at the meeting.

We print below Barrows Dunham's opening remarks, E. Y. Harburg's "Birthday Song" and the messages from abroad which were read at the meeting.—The Editors

Birthday Speech by Barrows Dunham

At fifteen, a journal is pleasantly, soundly, vigorously mature—plentiful in wisdom and likely to be yet more plentiful. The editors have become sages, and have nothing left but to become oracles. Later on this evening, I shall present the sages to you, and then we shall discover perhaps that the ascent to Delphi has already been accomplished.

This is a good year for a fifteenth birthday, a good year in which to be mature. It is a year of Cleopatra, of Shakespeare, and of a sudden admonition to think unthinkable thoughts. Many of us will have supposed that an admonition to think unthinkable thoughts is an admonition to think about socialism. If so, we have not moved quite far enough. For socialism is itself a subject about which there are unthinkable thoughts; and the more numerous the nations are that become socialist, the more numerous the thoughts about socialism that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

become unthinkable. As readers of a recent book will know, every human organization has an orthodoxy which it defends, and, by consequence, heresies which it attacks.

I hope you will allow me, for ten minutes' space, to think and to utter certain unthinkable thoughts. It is worth doing on a birthday, when the grown and growing man contemplates his past deeds and the thousand deeds he has yet to do. And, to begin with, I recall to your memory the socialist thesis that if men collectively administer the production and distribution of goods and services, they can supply to everyone so great an abundance of both that the problem will no longer be how to maintain life but how to occupy time. Once we have all that leisure, we shall at last see what man, the rational but no longer the needy animal, can do.

Such was the concept which, a hundred years or so ago, was set moving among human affairs, with what strife and clamor we now know well enough. It is an immense idea and has had immense effect: perhaps only Marx knew the immensity of both. But the idea and its effects moved among human beings, who had the usual appetites and frailties, who had to act within the odious customs of power politics, and who were, moreover, at different stages of development. History, which is perhaps Descartes' "malignant demon," stands everything on its head; and so it came to pass that socialism was attained in just those areas where abundance was not available. One can say that things happen according to expectation, provided that expectation includes the unexpected.

This year being Shakespeare's four hundredth anniversary, let us take his view of affairs and in particular his view of Cleopatra. The passage is very famous. Maecenas has observed than Antony must surely desert Cleopatra, be renegade to her love; and Enobarbus replies,

> . . . Never; he will not.
> Age cannot wither her, nor custom stale
> Her infinite variety: other women cloy
> The appetites they feed: but she makes hungry
> Where most she satisfies: for vilest things
> Become themselves in her: that the holy priests
> Bless her when she is riggish.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We are with Enobarbus, are we not? That infinite variety! How sure has been the doom of men who did not see it! The right-wing socialists, who fought socialism in her advent—where have they been these forty-seven years? Where also the left-wing socialists, the "r-r-r-revolutionaries," as Lenin used to call them? And where, I must ask, will those professing socialists be who regard an authentic and developed socialism as "revisionist," or who, by contrast, regard an authentic and less developed socialism as "adventurist"?

Infinite variety! Is it not clear that there are, and will be, as many socialisms as there are peoples that are socialist? Marxists are supposed—according, at least, to their own assertions—to be able to see identity in difference. Why can they not equal Shakespeare's Enobarbus, who saw difference in identity? I am sure that they can and, the thought being not really unthinkable, I think that they will.

And now a second unthinkable thought: "she makes hungry where most she satisfies." Every young idealist—and idealists are forever young—expects that his ideal, when realized, will put an end to problems. Within certain limits he is right about this. The limits are that every solution to a problem begets other problems, and that consequently the most that can be hoped for is a solution which will make problems more easily solved. I think that Marx conceived socialism to be exactly this sort of solution. Possessing it, we would be more nearly masters of our fate and therefore able to do more easily what might be needed to be done. Whether or not this is in fact the case is now in process of practical demonstration. It is one of several things that make one glad to be alive.

A third unthinkable thought? Well, it is that "vilest things become themselves in her." For there have indeed been vile things. Socialism in her advent and first life imitated the habits of her adversaries in order to survive. Possibly (though I think not) she could have avoided this; certainly (so I should say) she did it wantonly and to excess. She has been, in all climes and populations, as Enobarbus says, "riggish."

And yet, in all climes and populations, she has had and does still manifest the infallible charm. The charm is not sexual (for here my analogy collapses), although I have known pro-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fessing socialists who had that appetite chiefly on their minds. The charm is, first and always, the charm of being at last rational, of conducting human affairs in a way that makes sense, a way that does not violate but heals and rejoices one's feeling of how things *ought* to be done. It is absurd for us to kill one another when we could kiss and be happy. It is absurd to hate when there is so much opportunity to love. And I think that vilest things, when done on behalf of love and happiness and rationality, do "become themselves," without, however, ceasing to be vile.

Such will have been my thoughts upon a birthday. We wish, as always, many happy returns—returns of valor, of wisdom, and of that love which lets variety thrive. It is one of man's burdens that the power of this love is so little known. We have it now and here, sharing, though with all our differences, a common hope. "Love is not love," said our poet, "which alters when it alteration finds." And we, for our part, assert that we will not bend with the remover to remove.

EDGAR SNOW
Switzerland

Here's one anniversary I'm really sorry to miss. Congratulations to Huberman-Sweezy's MR and MRP on attaining age 15. Another six years and all four of you may be able to vote. Meanwhile, all honest men will continue to vote *for* you!

JULIO ALVAREZ DEL VAYO
Geneva

My warmest congratulations. I consider MONTHLY REVIEW the most serious, valuable publication of its kind in the United States. I will correct myself: not of its kind, because it is unique.

Its publication in Spanish has been a big event for all the progressive forces of Latin America. It will be largely read in a liberated Spain.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WILLIAM J. POMEROY
London

The first time I ever saw a copy of MONTHLY REVIEW was in a prison in the Philippines, where I was confined for participating in that country's national liberation struggles. It came in disguised in the jacket of what was considered to be a "safe" publication for myself and for my fellow political prisoners to read. To us, who had been starved for years for an understanding of what was going on in the world beyond us, it was like the restoration of our senses. We drew more encouragement from reading that single copy of MONTHLY REVIEW than from anything else we had been permitted to see for nearly ten years. To me that episode epitomizes the esteem in which MONTHLY REVIEW and its editors are held by the liberating forces in many colonial and semi-colonial countries. It is a great counterforce to American imperialism that weighs heavily on the people of those countries. My greeting to MONTHLY REVIEW tonight is sent also in the name of my Filipino comrades who are still in prison and whose freedom will be aided by such a publication and the clarity that it gives to struggle.

GORDON LEWIS
University of Puerto Rico

I would like to congratulate MR's remarkable twin editors on their effort to enter the Caribbean and Latin American fields, hitherto parochially neglected by the American Left. From where I am, here in Puerto Rico, it is quite clear that, like Spain in the thirties, Cuba in the sixties is the *crise de conscience* of world socialism; and Leo Huberman and Paul Sweezy have instinctively realized it. Indeed, as an English socialist, it is obvious to me that MR is doing today what the Left Book Club did in the England of the prewar period—keeping the socialist ethic alive in a hostile world. I am happy to be a Caribbean voice of congratulations.

(*messages continued on page* 118)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Birthday Song by E. Y. Harburg

Sung to the tune of "The Streets of Laredo"

When I was a lad
I wrote amorous ditties,
To Judy, Aleine, Edelina, and Sue,
But now that I'm gray
I've abandoned those pretties,
I'm singing my songs to the MONTHLY REVIEW.

For as you grow older
You sometimes grow wiser
If brain cells are plenty
And hormones are few
Why torture yourself with Elaine or Eliza
You're safer by far with the MONTHLY REVIEW.
That most intellectual
Slightly sub sexual
Marx will protect you all, MONTHLY REVIEW.

For fifteen long years
I've perused and pursued her,
I've waited whole months
For a sight of her too
Whatever her mood
I still wooed and renewed her
That beautiful, sensible MONTHLY REVIEW.

II

I followed her madly
From Vietnam to China
To Cuba to Ghana, New Guinea, Peru,
I may have been faithless
To my Edelina,
But not to that siren, the MONTHLY REVIEW.
That wise and effectively
Spoken objectively
Let's love collectively MONTHLY REVIEW.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Her light is the light
In the eyes of all lovers,
Her voice is the sound
Of a morning that's new
I take her to bed
And I find between covers
The comforting lines of my MONTHLY REVIEW.

Her format is lovely,
her layout historic
Her foresight and hindsight
Are beautiful too,
Forgive me for being
So meta-euphoric
I swoon for my beautiful MONTHLY REVIEW.
That wholly reliable
Vibrant and viable
Tho F.B.I. . .able MONTHLY REVIEW.

III

So here's to the goal
Of her bold aspirations,
And may the great day
Of her dream soon come true.
A lot more subscriptions
A few more donations
Will speed the good health of the MONTHLY REVIEW.

Oh bright be her journey,
Her long road made easy,
And strong be the hearts
Of her staff and her crew,
And blessed be her pilots
Brave Huby and Sweezy
And all the fine friends of the MONTHLY REVIEW.
That anti-insanity
Free from all vanity
Friend of humanity MONTHLY REVIEW.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*continued from page* 115)

OSKAR LANGE
Council of State, Warsaw

MONTHLY REVIEW has developed into what I consider one of the best journals giving an original and up-to-date Marxist analysis of actual economic, social, and political problems.

For me personally the articles published in MONTHLY REVIEW are always a source of creative Marxist analysis of present-day problems. I have drawn very much upon this source and I am much indebted to MONTHLY REVIEW in my work on economic and social analysis. This holds also, I know, for many of my friends in my country. MONTHLY REVIEW has become a major factor in the development of Marxist thought.

D. D. KOSAMBI
Poona, India

To those of us who know of America (the U.S.A.) only as the breeding ground for rich and ill-mannered tourists, the stamping ground for power-hungry politicians, and the dominant member of a great bloc which threatens world peace, the MONTHLY REVIEW brings a solitary and most welcome ray of hope. To have started such a journal in the McCarthy era, to have kept it going to ever greater successes without the subsidy of rich advertising, to keep it so eminently attractive to all thinking progressives without party-line sloganeering, to have maintained a uniformly high standard of current analysis and of thought—this is an achievement of which any intellectuals in any country may have been proud. That it was done in the U.S.A. is of the utmost significance to all of us who wondered what had become of the Spirit of 1776, of the Gettysburg Address, and of the New Deal. To me, personally, it is the finest of stimulants in many bitter moments.

EDUARDO GALEANO
Marcha, Montevideo

It is a great satisfaction for me to greet MR on its fifteenth anniversary. I salute the magazine and the publishing

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

division, its directors, my dear friends, L. H. and P. S., untiring fighters in the revolutionary cause. And I also greet that which is the inspiration, beneficiary, and guide of MR, the public in the United States which refuses with dignity to allow itself to be devoured by the machinations of the publicity, raised to a tremendous level in that country, that manufactures the truth according to the needs and convenience of those monopolies which give direction to the life of the capitalist world.

Through my testimonial should be heard the gentle voice of the South American people who have now won, thanks to the Spanish edition of MR, the right to listen to the independent voice of the North American Left.

From a co-worker, reader and friend, warm embraces.

CHEDDI JAGAN
British Guiana

If how to win friends and influence people were the only yardstick by which to judge its place in the world of politics, economics, and sociology, the editors and contributors could each, with justification, feel ten feet tall. But mere numbers of readers or subscribers is not the only criterion that we must use in adding up its achievements. We must take account of the quality of its readership. Professors and students at universities, school teachers, politicians, professional men in all walks of life, trade union leaders, civil servants, religious leaders—these, I believe, form a high percentage of subscribers and readers who scan the pages of MR, seeking facts and figures and a greater understanding of the political and economic ferments of our time. Speaking for myself and many of my associates, we have come to appreciate its high qualities—its careful analyses of the contemporary scene, its objective approach to and lucid presentation of problems, and withal its bias—a bias that recognizes the need to redress the imbalance between the Haves and the Have Nots, to expose the impulsions towards war, and to point the road to peace.

I wish MONTHLY REVIEW and MR Press continued success and an ever-widening circle of friends, readers, and subscribers.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOL ADLER
Peking

MONTHLY REVIEW has already made great contributions to the cause of progress by helping to keep alive the spark of socialism in America through the darkest days of United States reaction, by its unflinching support of the Negro liberation struggle and of the Latin American people's revolutionary movement, and by its honest and principled attempts to clarify many of the major issues facing American progressives. I am confident that it will make even greater contributions in the future. All genuine American progressives have every right to be proud of the achievements of MONTHLY REVIEW, its devoted editors, Leo Huberman and Paul Sweezy, and its equally devoted editorial staff. Long life to you all!

CEDRIC BELFRAGE
Mexico

MONTHLY REVIEW has not only survived McCarthyism and the Cold War ice age but, because of its always principled position, has been able to take in stride, without a blush of remorse and always in a positive manner, the more complex problems stemming out of the 20th Soviet Party Congress and the Peking-Moscow dispute. The magazine has become an institution in which the independent Left throughout the world takes pride. Its readers know that its opinions are always based on the clearest thinking of which two of the Left's clearest minds are capable, in light of all the facts at hand. When it has erred, it never hesitated to say so in light of new facts.

I have admired every single issue whether I agreed or not, though I generally did. Having personally learned what prestige it enjoys in Latin America, I heartily congratulate MR on becoming the first decent *yanqui* publication to appear in Spanish. This is what is needed to prevent thoughtful Latin Americans from giving way to despair about the United States.

I wish MR as eternal a life as the fickle gods of journalism ever vouchsafe to any publication.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD EVENTS

By Scott Nearing

United States Flights in Cuban Air Space

Max Frankel reported from Washington on April 20th: "The United States said today that its aerial reconnaissance flights over Cuba would continue indefinitely. It warned that any interference with them 'could create a highly dangerous situation'." (*New York Times,* April 21.)

President Johnson, at his April 21st press conference, was asked about Cuban overflights. His answer: "I do think it is necessary that we maintain surveillance and know whether any missiles are being shipped into Cuba. We will have to maintain our reconnaissance and overflights. Any action on their part to stop this would be a very serious action. We have so informed them and informed their friends." (Text, *New York Times,* April 22.)

Cuba's immediate response to this Washington declaration of its intention to continue violating Cuban sovereignty was a general complaint to the United Nations against United States aggression. On April 30 Premier Castro descended from the realm of utopian idealism to the brass tacks of power politics. He said, "We will prevent these flights to the limits of what our weapons can do." (*New York Times,* May 1.)

Speaking in Havana on May 1st, Dr. Castro said: "For our security it is necessary that these flights stop. Cuba will not let herself be humiliated. We are not warmongers, but we are not afraid of war. We shall fight if the war is imposed on us." He added: "If all reasoning is useless we shall consider these flights as armed aggression and as such we shall repel this aggression with arms." (*New York Times,* May 2.)

United States imperialists find it "necessary" to invade Cuba's air space. Cuban patriots are prepared to fight for their independence.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When will the 1964 Battle of Bunker Hill begin? Where will it be fought? Who will start the fighting? How will the United Nations meet the challenge to world order and peace?

The Warfare State

States make war as one of their sovereign prerogatives, but only a few states are professional warmakers.

The title "warfare state" should be reserved for one which uses war and the threat of war as the decisive instrument of its foreign policy. In a warfare state the body politic places at the top of its list of state activities: planning for war, preparing for war, and waging war when opportunity offers.

Applicants for the title of Warfare State must pass five severe tests:

(1) Applicant states must have a history of making war—preferably successful war.

(2) Applicants must show generous allocations of public money for military preparedness.

(3) The military, in the applicant nation, must play a prominent role in making state policy.

(4) Military personnel must hold a high position in the social hierarchy.

(5) Public response to war and especially to victorious war must be enthusiastic and tumultuous.

Judged by these five criteria: Sparta organized a Warfare State. Rome became a Warfare State. Frederick the Great established a Warfare State. Napoleon did the same for France. Japan developed a Warfare State by the 1930's. Hitler converted Germany into a Warfare State.

The United States, since the war with Spain in 1898, has grown into the role of Warfare Statehood with only incidental opposition and with widespread public approbation. Detailed support for this contention will be found in Fred J. Cook's factual study *The Warfare State* (New York, 1962). The book is a classic.

Economic Stagnation in America

Swedish economist Gunnar Myrdal begins his new book *Challenge to Affluence* (New York, 1963) with a section head-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ed "Relative Economic Stagnation in America." He writes: "The record of economic development in the United States is unsatisfactory. When all is added up, the average annual growth rate during the decade up to 1962 comes out well below 3 percent. . . . An ominous fact in America is the high and rising level of unemployment."

"Capturing" a Foreign Market

An Argentine economist, writing about the adverse effects of imperialism upon Argentina's internal economic structure, notes that during the Second World War, which cut off exports from the industrialized countries, Argentina's economy enjoyed a notable boom. After the war, however, imports from Europe and North America flooded into the Argentinian market, bringing disaster to its infant industries. The production of textiles, ready-made clothing, wooden ware, leather goods, and electrical fixtures actually declined during the 1948-1959 decade, despite a rapid population increase. In the case of textile manufacturing, Argentina's production decreased by a third between 1949 and 1959.

Production of machinery and capital equipment suffered even more severely than that of consumer goods. At war's end, in 1945, Argentina was still industrially backward, but the economic policies which the Argentinian government was following, under pressure from the highly industrialized countries, were designed not to expedite but to retard Argentinian industrialization. Argentina, with abundant petroleum reserves, "was importing petroleum, but not the equipment for extracting it from our subsoil; was importing coal, but not the means for developing our own coal fields; was importing millions of tons of steel, but not the means of creating a national steel industry. They imported sodium and other basic chemicals, but not the equipment which would have made possible their local production." (Marcelo Isacovich, *Argentina Economica y Social,* Buenos Aires, 1961, p. 148.)

This is a typical example of imperial-colonial relations. Colonies supply foods and raw materials produced by low-paid labor and buy back from the imperialists manufactures and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

services turned out by high-paid labor. Colonials sell cheap and buy dear. Imperialists buy cheap and sell dear. Imperialists prosper. Colonials suffer indefinitely from the unemployment, poverty, ignorance, and disease that are the normal products of imperialist-colonial relations.

Divided We Fall

Europe is a divided continent. It is divided geographically by the towering upthrust of the Alps mountains. It is divided politically into a score of sovereign states, organized in power blocs. It is divided economically by frontiers which are often more difficult to cross than the highest mountains or the broadest rivers. It is divided culturally by rival and often hostile political, religious, and linguistic barriers.

Barriers which separate the peoples of Europe are not new. Since the breakup of the Roman Empire, Europe has not only been divided but Europeans have given themselves over to repeated orgies of destruction and rapine, followed by a redivision of territory on the principle of booty to the victor and woe to the vanquished.

This competitive struggle for wealth and power has been supported, ideologically, by a wide range of religious, racial, and nationalist propaganda designed to justify rivalry, hostility, and periodical military conflict. So effective has this propaganda been that during the past 450 years two thirds of the world's wars have been fought wholly or chiefly in a Europe which held less than a quarter of the world's population. (Quincy Wright, *A Study of War*, Chicago, 1942.)

Ambitious politicians and profiteers have camouflaged the division of Europe by using the tricky and deceptive phrase "balance of power." The phrase is deceptive because it covers up the shifting relations between half a dozen of the wealthiest and best armed European nations. It is deceptive because it never was a balance, but a changing imbalance, inclined and deliberately weighted by delusions of national grandeur, by military preparedness and war.

Each period of military struggle is followed by relaxations of tension, regrouping of forces, a new armament race like the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one which began in 1903 or 1933 or 1946. Up to the present moment, each preparedness effort has led into a new orgy of carefully planned destruction and mass murder.

Spain, Holland, Britain, and France battered each other from 1650 to 1815 to decide which nation should dominate Europe and control American, Asian, and African colonies. As the machinations of diplomacy and the tides of battle ebbed and flowed, first one nation and then another was top dog. Britain and her allies won out in 1815 and set up the power balance which regulated the public life of Europe during the greater part of the 19th century.

Was it really a balance? For a brief period British supremacy was accepted, but as the century wore on, Russian interests pushed insistently south and east. After 1870 the chief European nations forced their way into Africa; while regrouped Central European nations, led by the Hohenzollerns, began their quest for a place in the sun. National rivalries and ambitions led through minor conflicts into the general war of 1914-1918. For three years Europe was balanced in a deadlock that was broken in 1917 by United States entry into the war.

Rivalries, continued after the Versailles peace treaty of 1919, were intensified by the power vacuum created by the defeat of Germany, the dismemberment of Austro-Hungary, and the overthrow of the Romanoffs.

Peace conferees at Versailles took measures to check the movement of Bolshevism into Central Europe. One of these measures was the rearmament of Germany, which led to six years of war that ended in the Potsdam Agreements of 1945.

Again, during this struggle, the European power balance was deadlocked, but by 1948, with the states of Eastern Europe moving into the socialist camp, one half of Europe (geographically) was socialist, the other half was capitalist, imperialist, or progressive capitalist. The contest between Eastern and Western Europe, usually called the Cold War, would have been lost by the West but for the very large armed forces maintained by the United States in Europe, the immense sums of economic aid supplied by the United States, and the vigorous United States-backed policy of re-industrializing and rearming a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

West Germany that under the Potsdam Agreements was to have remained permanently disarmed.

Had the North Atlantic Treaty Organization developed effective economic and military strength, something like a balance between West and East might have been achieved, but the struggles over tariffs and trade, over Suez, and over the Common Market, prevented stability. Subsequently French intransigence excluded London and challenged the leadership of Washington in the determination of Western Europe's economic and political policies.

Today's Warsaw Pact provides the countries of Eastern Europe with at least a semblance of planned, balanced unity. Western and Central European nations continue to struggle against each other for place and power. France insists upon leadership. Germany, re-equipped and rearmed, is the strongest economic and political unit of Western Europe. Britain is isolated. Italy is undecided. Lack of unity could scarcely be more complete. From a power standpoint, the major effective force in Western Europe remains with the air, sea, and land forces of the United States, concentrated in Germany.

With massive weaponry in both Eastern and Western Europe, with an arms race that proceeds and accelerates, whatever balance exists is not a balance of power but a balance of terror. Any general use of this weaponry would depopulate Europe and leave it a smoldering ruin.

Thus the tricky and deceptive "balance of power," built upon rival weaponry, has proved to be no balance at all but the brink of a yawning precipice at the bottom of which lies oblivion.

Twice in fifty years Europeans and their allies have spent fabulous amounts of wealth and manpower in order to decide which national power bloc would control European resources, direct its technology, and exploit its peoples.

These are the cold inescapable facts which stare Western man in the face in the opening months of 1964. They will continue to stare and to threaten until we in the West learn how to end war and to make peace.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CHINA AND THE USSR

Latest Comments on the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union by the Editorial Department of *Renmin Ribao* (People's Daily) and *Hongqi* Red Flag). Published in English by the FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS, Peking

VII THE LEADERS OF THE CPSU ARE THE GREATEST SPLITTERS OF OUR TIMES

• A Review of History • Refutation of the Charge of Supporting Anti-Party Groups in Fraternal Parties • The Way to Defend and Strengthen Unity

66 pp. paper 25¢

VIII THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION AND KHRUSHCHEV'S REVISIONISM

• A Discipline of Bernstein and Kautsky • Lies Cannot Cover Up Reality • Refutation of the Parliamentary Road • From Browder and Tito to Khrushchev • Our Hopes 72 pp. paper 25¢

Earlier COMMENTS Nos. 1-6 in this series available at 25¢ each. Discounts on quantity orders. All eight titles for $1.50. 1) The Origin and Development of the Differences between the Leadership of the CPSU and Ourselves 2) On the Question of Stalin 3) Is Yugoslavia a Socialist Country? 4) Apologists of Neo-Colonialism 5) Two Different Lines on the Question of War and Peace 6) Peaceful Coexistence —Two Diametrically Opposed Policies

From your local bookstore or direct from
CHINA BOOKS & PERIODICALS
Importers and Distributors
292 Gough Street
San Francisco, Calif. 94102

Please send payment with order, adding 10¢ for postage. Write for our free catalog of 500 publications in English imported from the People's Republic of China. *For the latest political news from China, subscribe now to PEKING REVIEW* (weekly). Subscriptions processed under a U.S. Government License are airmailed direct from Peking. $4.00 per year.

(advertisement)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

F R E E

With every *new* Subscription

BROTHERS UNDER THE SKIN

by Carey McWilliams

Editor, *The Nation* 365 pp.

When BROTHERS UNDER THE SKIN was first issued (April 21, 1943) it evoked such comments as these:

> "Mr. McWilliams has rendered a very great public service in producing this volume, which is worth any twenty of the wartime books dealing with other phases of the national problem forced upon our attention by the crisis in our national life."
>
> —Oswald Garrison Villard, *Saturday Review*

> "The next time a Southern Congressman wants a book to read from in filibustering . . . I recommend that he try this one. It may serve to enlighten the Southerners but it will have some home truths for their Northern and Western colleagues." —Max Lerner, *PM*

Now, twenty-one years and a great many editions later, BROTHERS UNDER THE SKIN has been issued with a lengthy, new introduction assessing civil rights developments from 1943 to the present time.

> The new edition drew this comment from William Hogan, Book Editor, San Francisco *Chronicle,* "a classic study of American race relations."

For your FREE copy of BROTHERS UNDER THE SKIN, fill out the subscription coupon below, and start receiving *The Nation,* this country's oldest weekly journal of opinion—a truly *independent, critical* weekly—which since July 5, 1865 has been in the forefront of the fight for civil rights.

The Nation 333 Sixth Avenue New York, N. Y. 10014 MR
Herewith my order and payment for a NEW subscription to *The Nation.* Please send me FREE a copy of BROTHERS UNDER THE SKIN.

( ) One year, $10 ( ) 6 Months, $5
(Foreign & Canadian postage — $1 per year extra)

Name .....

Address .....

City ..... State ..... Zip No. .....

(advertisement)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*continued from inside front cover*)

It has taken 15 years but now, at long last, MR Press books seem to have broken into the review columns of the respectable press. On April 12, *Puerto Rico* by Gordon Lewis, was reviewed at length in the *New York Times Book Review*; on May 17, in the same paper, *Waste* by Danilo Dolci was coupled with another book in a long favorable review-essay that began on page 3; and *Waste*, we are informed, will be reviewed with pictures in the *Saturday Review*, issue of June 6.

The column entitled "Paperbacks in Review" in the Book Review section of the *New York Times* of May 10, carried this excellent note:

> Another interesting survey of the present and its implications for the future of Latin America is WHITHER LATIN AMERICA? (Monthly Review, $1.45). Twelve articles by as many hands compose the book, and the authors include Latin Americans, North Americans and Europeans. Their viewpoint is mostly socialist and their attitudes generally critical of U.S. policy. But what they say is often well-reasoned, and it represents an opinion all too rarely found in our mass-communications media.

The Left-Labour weekly *Tribune*, in England, has carried reviews of MR Press books before, but in May we had notices of our books on two successive weeks. On May 1, the columnist John Marullus says of the essays in *The Socialist Register, 1964* that they had "the extraordinary effect of inducing *thought* and in particular, thought about socialism." (Note on the back cover that you still have time to get your copy of *Register*—and four other books—at the prepub price).

The reviewer of O'Connor's *Revolt in Seattle*, on May 8, went all out: "There isn't a sentence in this book the socialist who likes characters with guts won't enjoy . . . it ought to be made a must for all socialists." Amen

Our July-August double issue will be a short book on British Guiana by Philip Reno. It will be sold also as an MR Press paperback. (Be sure we have your summer address for this issue.)

Happy vacation to all.

BOUND AND UNBOUND VOLUMES OF *MR*

	Bound	Unbound		Bound	Unbound
1. (May 1949-Apr. 1950)	$ 16	$ 12	9. (1957-1958)	$ 13	$ 9
2. (1950-1951)	$ 24	$ 20*	10. (1958-1959)	$ 16	$ 12
3. (1951-1952)	$ 13	$ 9	11. (1959-1960)	$ 10	$ 6
4. (1952-1953)	$ 13	$ 9	12. (1960-1961)	$ 16	$ 12
5. (1953-1954)	$ 15	$ 11	13. (1961-1962)	$ 10	$ 6
6. (1954-1955)	$ 13	$ 9	14. (1962-1963)	$ 10	$ 6
7. (1955-1956)	$ 15	$ 11	15. (1963-1964)	$ 10	$ 6
8. (1956-1957)	$ 13	$ 9	Entire Set:	$207	$147

* Vol. 2, No. 5 is not available in unbound sets.

Some of our earlier issues are out of stock. If any readers have copies of the following numbers and would return them to us, we will gladly exchange for any MR Press pamphlet or paperback book: Vol. 2, Nos. 5, 6, 7, and 8.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR PRESS

books which you can get ahead of time and save money by ordering now

by Gilles Martinet

Price on pub date, July 1: $3.25
Prepublication price: 2.00

by Leo Huberman

Price on pub date, July 28: $5.00
Prepublication price: 3.00

edited by Ralph Miliband and John Saville

Price on pub date, July 30: ..... $6.00 cloth; $3.45 paper
Prepublication price: ..... 4.00 cloth; 2.50 paper

by Ralph Miliband

Price on pub date, Sept. 30: ..... $6.00 cloth; $3.45 paper
Prepublication price: ..... 4.00 cloth; 2.50 paper

by Rosa Luxemburg

Price on pub date, Sept. 30: ..... $7.50 cloth; $3.95 paper
Prepublication price: ..... 5.00 cloth; 2.75 paper

Send your order, with payment enclosed, to

Monthly Review Press 333 Sixth Avenue New York, N. Y. 10014

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED